The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1887.

The Week.

THE coal-heavers in New Jersey have struck for an advance of wages, and propose to have the fairness of the demand settled by the arbitration of "District Assembly No. 49"—that is, by themselves. Their work is heaving or "handling" coal—that is, shovelling it from cars into barges, or from barges into cars, as the case may be—the lowest form of manual labor. They say that if they get what they ask for, their pay will amount to two dollars a day, which seems high for this sort of work at this season. But, whether high or low, the fact is that for every man who does not think one dollar and seventy-five cents enough for this sort of work, there is another waiting for the job which he rejects, and eager to take it if they can get protection from the police while doing it. The same thing is true of the striking 'longshoremen who are now disturbing the steamship owners. The trouble there is, that the Union men do not wish other men to accept payment of their wages by the week or by the month from the Old Dominion Company, instead of payment by the hour. There is, as we understand it, no dispute about the rate of wages. Nor is there any dispute between the company and that portion of the men who are paid by the week, about the time of payment. A does not say that he does not wish to be paid by the week or month, but by the hour. On the contrary, he prefers it because it means steady work. It is B, who is paid by the hour, or is not in the employment of the companies at all, who is dissatisfied by the way in which A is hired. He therefore tells A that he must not be paid monthly or weekly, and, on A's refusing to heed him, lies in wait for him as he goes to his work, and tries to hit him with a stick or stone. More than this, B goes to other steamship wharves, and threatens to hit with sticks and stones anybody who moves freight which has ever passed through A's hands. While all this is going on, not only is an important branch of business suspended or greatly impeded, but A and his family live in terror of their lives—almost as great terror as if they were settlers in the Apache country when Geronimo was afield. His wife and children expect every morning when he leaves his home to see him brought back with his skull fractured or his ribs broken, and all because B does not like weekly payments.

There are concerned in the coal strike about 6,000 men, all manual laborers—that is, 3,000 on strike, and 3,000 who want, if protected by the law, to do the work which the strikers refuse to do. The presumption is that the latter 3,000 possess in a far higher degree than the others the conditions which in a laborer excite commiseration. They are evidently poorer; they are more willing to work; they have undoubtedly families in a large number of cases dependent on them for support. They are, too, much more peaceable, for, instead of attacking the strikers and driving them from their work, so as to get the job for themselves, they allow the strikers to drive them from it, in the absence of police protection. Nevertheless, they are a forgotten element in most of the discussions about strikes. Nine out of ten of us when we talk of "labor," mean simply the laborers who join the unions, and never think of the still larger number of even more necessitous laborers who do not choose to join the unions. We talk as if the 3,000 strikers had a right to be employed to heave coal by a particular employer, and as if the other 3,000 had no right to be employed by anybody, but were bound to look on and starve, while the strikers loafed and lived on "assessments."

There seems, in view of the proceedings at St. Stephen's Church on Monday, nothing for the followers of Henry George to do but start a church of their own. We do not believe that any of the existing religious denominations has the requisite accommodation for the doctrine that the land of the country may be lawfully taken from its present owners without compensation. This may be possibly a moral doctrine or the doctrine of the future, but no existing church is ready for it or likely to be within any reasonable period. In all existing churches no distinction is made between real and personal estate, as the subject of property rights; and all consider the ousting of a man from his house or land against his will to be robbery in the ordinary acceptation of that term, and as such an improper thing for a good church member, and much more a professional theologian, to advocate or be engaged in. Under these circumstances, if the Georgites feel the need of a religious creed and religious services of their own, the wise and kindly thing to do is to start a church, and embody the George view of land in the creed. It is not for us to suggest the precise way in which it should be organized, but it may not be unbecoming to express the opinion that Henry George should occupy a very high, if not the highest, place in the hierarchy. In fact, the place of Archbishop does not seem a bit too high for him. It would not, in truth, be as high as that held by another famous reformer, Brigham Young, in the Mormon Church. The advantages, too, of belonging to a church whose founder is still living, and may be consulted at any moment on knotty points of doctrine and discipline, are too obvious to need enumeration.

The popular demonstrations in favor of Dr. McGlynn are, no doubt, deserved tributes to his long, laborious, and faithful services as a pastor. But such services are common among the Catholic priesthood. Indeed, a parish priest who should fail in rendering them could not long hold his place. Neither the services themselves nor the affection which they inspire can hide the real issue of the controversy, which is whether Dr. McGlynn will obey an authority which even Martin Luther recognized and bowed to when he was summoned to the Diet of Worms. What the authorities of the Church at Rome might do if its summons were obeyed, is an after consideration; but the meetings held and the resolutions passed on Monday went upon the assumption that Dr. McGlynn had already been tried and condemned, which is wholly gratuitous and strictly false. Nor does it stand to reason that the Church of Rome, in so grave a matter as this, is likely to have its counsels swayed and its world-wide policy established by the assumed prejudices of Archbishop Corrigan and Vicar-General Preston in New York.

The anti-Mormon bill as passed by the House last week preserves the main features of the act as it was sent over from the Senate last winter. The most important new departure in this measure is the section which annuls all territorial acts establishing the religious corporation known as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, and the corporation known as the Perpetual Fund Emigration Company, and makes it the duty of the Attorney-General to dissolve these corporations. It is through these corporations that the Mormon Church has done its work, and their destruction is undoubtedly a terrible blow for the hierarchy. At the same time it must be admitted that the North Carolina member who opposed the bill on the ground that this proposition is unconstitutional, made out a strong case. The Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and it is certainly a grave question whether under this provision it has the right to dissolve a religious corporation because members of the corporation break the laws. The principle that a legislative body may thus interfere in religious matters is a dangerous one to establish, and its adoption in this case is the less excusable because there seems no doubt that polygamy could be overthrown without recourse to so doubtful an expedient.

The passage of so drastic a measure with scarcely a dissenting vote by a Democratic House disposes of another Republican bogy. Next to the theory that the Democrats were going to pay the rebel debt and pension the ex-Confederates, perhaps the most popular of the old stand bys for the Republican organs and stump-speakers has been the claim that the Democrats favored polygamy in the expectation of converting the Territory of Utah into a Democratic State. At the rate things are now moving, there will not be a splinter left by 1888 of that ancient "view-with-alarm" plank of the Republican platform.

The House of Representatives passed last week the measure, which had been urgently recommended by the President in his annual message, to provide for an additional Judge of the United States Court in New York, but not without some remonstrance from Western members, who alleged that their needs for more judges were quite as pressing as those of the commercial metropolis. If this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claim is well founded, it is an argument for more judges at the West also. No disposition of the Treasury surplus, or that small portion of it required to recompense the Federal bench, can be made so advantageously as by employing a sufficient number of first-class men, and paying them first-class salaries, to clear the court dockets and keep them clear. The delays of justice in the Federal courts, and in State courts as well, amount in many cases to a denial of justice. How great and aggravating is that denial here in New York a few facts will explain. Secretary Manning, in reply to a House resolution of March 23, 1886, stated that there were then pending in this district 2,201 separate revenue causes dating from October, 1867, and involving the aggregate sum of $11,519,268. It was estimated that the interest running against the Government on the claims, which would probably be decided in favor of the plaintiffs, was $150,000 per annum —an amount sufficient to pay the salaries of twenty-five judges at their present rate of compensation. This is the state of the case as regards Government business only, or rather one single branch of it. How must it be with the ordinary business of private litigants? The truth is, that New York has become as great a centre of commercial litigation as it is of commercial transactions generally. The business of the Stock Exchange, and of the Clearing-house (as compared with other similar institutions in the United States) is fairly representative of the business of the United States courts. Suits involving railroad and other corporations in Texas, Oregon, and every State in the Union, and mining properties in all the Territories, are multiplying here all the time. Patent suits are gravitating here more and more, while the admiralty business corresponds in magnitude to the shipping carried on at this port, and the criminal business is no small item. The net result is a perfect gorge, at which the Judges, Wallace and Brown, with such help as they can occasionally get from neighboring districts, are toiling with more than Sisyphean industry. It ought to be an axiom of the public service that its judicial equipment should keep pace with the country's growth. Instead of one new judge for this district we ought to have six, and they ought to have $10,000 a year each. They could all be kept employed.

The passage by the House of the bill to pension all dependent soldiers and dependent parents of soldiers is the first departure, on a large scale, from the foundation principle of pension laws. This principle affirms, that the Government is held to look after and provide for those soldiers who have been more or less disabled and hindered from earning a living by wounds or disease contracted in the service. As to all others, it made a contract to pay them so much per month, to provide them with rations and clothing, and restore hem at the expiration of the service to their respective homes. Some departures have been made from this rule in particular cases before now, and these have whetted a demand that the rule itself shall be set aside, as it has now been by the vote of the House. The new rule, if anything can be called a rule which is only the discretion of Congress, means that pensions shall hereafter be granted according to the ability of the taxpayers to supply the money. This is what we are coming to. But the worst part of the bill that was passed on Monday is that which makes "dependence" a gauge of the right to draw a pension. It is a premium on sloth, a discouragement to independence. When we read the piteous tales of hardship endured by ex-soldiers after twenty-three years of peace—hardship not traceable to military service in any way whatever—we sometimes wonder what must be the condition of the ex-Confederates, to whom no pension ever comes, no matter what degree of disability may have been incurred by them in addition to the loss of the great battle itself. How do these men get a living? Who supports them?

There is an air of opéra bouffe about the proposed investigation of the Pacific Railroads by a permanent salaried, and boarded, and free-passed, and liquored, and tobaccoed commission attached to the Interior Department. The character of the investigation is disclosed by a letter written by Theophilus French, ex-Auditor of the Pacific Railroads, to a person in the office of the Central Pacific Company, obviously intended to be shown to Mr. Huntington, in which Mr. French hints darkly at certain memoranda that he obtained in his official capacity years ago. It might be worth while for Mr. Huntington to pay something to get those memoranda out of French's hands, but he thought on the whole that it would be better to take the public into his confidence immediately by sending French's letter to the newspapers, and herein we agree with Mr. Huntington. It is reported that another ex official of the Auditor's office, a more recent product than French, and also a more rapacious one, is working up the proposed investigation. The steps taken by the intending blackmailers show very clearly that there is plenty of law on the statute-book now to make any desired investigation, for it is quite as easy for the present Auditor to get the information that French hints at as it was for French himself to get it. If Congress wants to know anything that has not been brought out in the numerous investigations and lawsuits of the past twenty years, it has only to signify its wishes to the officer in charge of the bureau created expressly for the purpose of auditing these accounts. This would be the regular course of procedure. The only objection to it appears to be that the present Auditor is a high-minded man, with a reputation to preserve, who would not lend himself to the particular kind of "investigation" that his predecessor, French, hints at. There may be items of past expenditure that the companies would rather not have made public, but they can much better afford to throw open their books than Congress can afford to equip a blackmailing commission.

A curious feature of the recent House debate upon naval reorganization was that the most important provision of the bill under consideration was ignored by both parties. The bill establishes a "board of council," which is to continue independently of the will of the Secretary of the Navy, except that he can change its personnel, and which is to advise him upon all questions of naval policy that he may submit to it. Under the existing system the Secretary of the Navy, like the heads of the other departments, gets the best counsel he can on each subject from the sources which he deems most authoritative. Whenever he wants the advice of a board, he convenes such a board as he thinks best, continues it as long as he finds it useful, and dissolves it when it has served his purpose. Under the proposed system a new Secretary, when he first enters the Department, will find a board already organized to receive him and to make his ignorance bliss, by tendering him professional counsel of so high authority that he will never need any knowledge of naval affairs except what his mentors may choose to impart. Then, when engines break down and ships capsize, he can compound with his conscience by the reflection that he never did anything but follow, to the best of his ability, the authority established by Congress for his guidance.

The project has no support in reason or in precedent. No one ever proposed or heard of a board of generals as a part of the legal organization of the War Department, to show the Secretary of War how to run his Department; nor did any Secretary of the Treasury ever ask Congress for a board of financial experts to advise him upon his fiscal policy. It would puzzle the most ingenious advocate of the plan to invent a sound reason why Congress should make the creation of a particular board of council mandatory upon the Secretary of the Navy rather than upon the Secretary of War or the head of any other department. The Naval Committee did not venture upon the perilous task of explaining it in their report, and it is curiously illustrative of the indisposition of Congress to scrutinize the measures before it that, in a three days' debate upon the bill, not a member called for the reason of so anomalous a feature. That it originated either with the Committee on Naval Affairs or with Secretary Whitney, no one supposes; in fact, it has been urged from time to time by a few naval officers for forty years. But it never before got so far on its way without being challenged and turned back.

No one can read the argument of Professor Smyth before the Andover Board of Visitors, as it has been published in full, without carrying away a high opinion of its acuteness and learning, and a conviction of the author's perfect sincerity. Not every one, however, will be persuaded that his defence is entirely successful. He easily shows that he has not departed from the Seminary creed more widely than those who are at the bottom of the prosecution. In fact, there is something singular about the sudden zeal for the creed on the part of those who have been known, for years, to hold it, in parts at least, in a thoroughly non-natural sense. Andover students of ten or fifteen years ago could hardly bring themselves to believe it possible, when these proceedings were first talked of, that Prof. Smyth, the most conservative man on the Faculty, hopelessly behind the times, according to the standard of Prof. Park's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lectures, should turn out a radical, while Prof. Park should appear as the virtual accuser of his colleague, on the ground of holding opinions at variance with the creed. There can be no complaint, certainly, by those who have brought on this trial that they have not been treated with abundant generosity by the defendants. Only in an incidental way have the latter shown that the prosecution did not object to departures from the creed, but simply to departures from its own particular departures. If an appearance of over-technicality is to be found in any part of Prof. Smyth's argument, it is where he contends for his right to hold to his views of future probation, even under a strict interpretation of the creed. That the new doctrine is not explicitly condemned in the creed may be true, but to contend, as the Professor does, that it is, in addition, logically implied in the creed, seems to be to fall into that confusion which Sir Henry Maine has shown to attach to the old idea that new legal decisions, really making new law, were yet but an inference from a definite, original set of legal principles. The unwillingness to admit a positive advance, which the author just cited affirms to be characteristic of jurisprudence, is an old failing of theology. And when Prof. Smyth goes further, and refuses to interpret the creed by the known opinions of the men who framed it, he would seem to be disowning one of the accepted canons of historical symbolics.

Decidedly the most interesting thing brought out in this trial is the attitude towards the Andover creed, not of the accused professors, but of their present judges. The testimony of Professors Hincks and Harris made it clear that they had been distinctly and directly authorized by the Board of Visitors to take the creed with any number of mental reservations, even including this very matter of future probation. We should think it must have been very hard for President Seelye and Dr. Eustis to maintain a becoming appearance of judicial gravity when it was put in evidence that they themselves had already passed upon the main question submitted to them, and that they were very much in the position of a civil judge called upon to find a man guilty of an offence which he had privately assured the accused was not indictable. To make this comic situation complete, it is now announced that a decision is not to be expected until after a considerable time; the judges must needs deliberate carefully, it is said. It had long been suspected that the trustees and visitors were of the opinion that the subscription exacted of the Andover professors meant nothing in particular. This suspicion became a certainty, three or four years ago, when Prof. Thayer demanded that the trustees should set him right by making public the assurances which they had given him in private, and indignantly resigned on their refusal to do so. After the express declarations made in the present trial, we do not see how it can any longer be questioned that the Andover idea of subscription is much like the old French Legitimist's view of the *Charte* as given to Niebuhr—"that it had been granted, but that of course there was no intention of observing it."

For some years past, Prince Bismarck has only put in an appearance in the Reichstag when it has become necessary to bring his personal influence to bear upon that body in the interest of Government measures. It is a matter of record that, on almost every such occasion, he has lost his temper, and, instead of argument, has employed violent abuse, threats, and insults in addressing the Opposition. It is not too much to say that no minister in Europe ever ventured to treat a representative body with such contemptuous imperiousness, and, but for the forbearance of his adversaries, out of deference to his age and great past services to Germany, his vehemence would have led more than once to turbulent scenes on the floor of the Reichstag. In his recent speeches on the Army Bill, he was more than true to his regular rôle of parliamentary bully. Nevertheless, the passage of the Army Bill could not possibly result in any immediate considerable strengthening of the imperial army, and its failure would not at all involve the national danger which the Chancellor made the burden of his speeches. The Minister of War admitted distinctly before the Committee to which the bill was referred, that, under the actual operation of the measure proposed by the Government, the army would be increased by only about 14,000 men at the end of the first year, and that it would take altogether fully twelve years to reach the total maximum increase of 150,000 men of the active army and reserve. He admitted, further, that if war should break out in the spring, it would be unwise to attempt to carry out the provisions of the bill, as this would obstruct the mobilization of the army. The Opposition had, therefore, the advantage of being able to contradict Bismarck's plea for the urgency of the bill out of the mouth of another spokesman of the Government.

Neither the speeches of Bismarck nor of Moltke contained anything new except Bismarck's contemptuous dismissal of the Bulgarian trouble as something which does not concern Germany, and for which Germany will certainly not break with Russia. This was doubtless intended to back up Moltke's warning to France that she is not going to catch Germany unprepared. The increase of the army, Moltke said, meant peace. The refusal to increase it would mean war, and France must also understand that no opportunity for aggression through an alliance with Russia was going to be afforded her. Of course, this is also a warning to Austria that she must look after her own interests in the Balkans, without help from Germany; but as she certainly can count on England and Italy, and has nothing to fear from Germany, it will probably not greatly disconcert her. France, it is pretty sure, will never take the field against any first-class Power until she has again tried her strength with Germany. All her military resources will be husbanded for a supreme effort to recover Alsace and Lorraine.

The condition in which this increase of armaments will leave Europe is something which will always remain a blot on the history of modern civilization. It is something which, in what is called "an industrial age," is really astounding. France, Austria, Germany, Italy, and Russia have very nearly 3,000,000 men in the flower of their age constantly under arms in time of peace, and offer enormous premiums to the best talent of the period for the improvement of instruments for the destruction of life and property. Besides this force, another still larger, although not constantly under arms, is kept more or less tormented and disturbed by drills and evolutions in preparation for war. All these Powers, too, are now gradually furnishing their troops with repeating rifles in exchange for the old breech-loaders, which made such a sensation twenty years ago. There is no immediate prospect of an end to this state of things until the Ottoman Empire is dead and it is finally settled who is to have Constantinople. Europe came out of the war of the French Revolution in 1815 with two burning questions constantly ready to set the Continent in a blaze. One was the Italian, and the other the Eastern question. The Italian question was disposed of by the three bloody wars of 1859, 1866, and 1870. The Eastern question has caused two almost equally bloody, that of the Crimea and that of 1877. These brought it somewhat nearer to a solution, but the end is still far off, and will probably only be reached by another frantic struggle. The Turk has his trunk packed and is ready to go, but he would be a bold man who should undertake to say who his successor will be.

The death of Lord Iddesleigh removes one of the best of the older school of politicians from English public life — the school which bred Canning and Peel and Gladstone, and which made the English House of Commons, since the Reform Bill, the foremost debating assembly in the world. He was an English gentleman of the very best sort, well-informed, conscientious, public-spirited, fair-minded, just, kindly, and good-tempered. He treated everybody courteously, and his statements in public and private life could be absolutely relied on. As soon as the Disraeli type of Toryism began to take root—the tricky, unscrupulous, evasive, and abusive type—Sir Stafford Northcote, as he then was, began to find himself more and more out of place, and his removal to the House of Lords was a plain hint that the party needed a different kind of man. Putting him in the Foreign Office while suffering from a disease which made excitement dangerous, was, in the present state of European politics, simply a sign of the extreme scarcity of first-rate men in the party. But the attempt of some of the Liberal journals to make political capital out of his death by throwing the blame of it on Lord Salisbury, seems brutal as well as absurd. Every man who goes into politics takes the chances of the game, and it is for him to judge whether he is physically fit to face them or not. Nobody else can or ought to decide for him whether they will put his life in danger or not. What those who put an unsound man in a responsible place have to consider, is not whether the duties of it will kill him, but whether he will be competent to discharge them properly while he lives.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

WEDNESDAY, January 12, to TUESDAY, January 18, 1887, inclusive.

DOMESTIC.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND has approved a new civil-service rule, giving the Civil-Service Commissioners power to appoint a Central Board of Examiners, to which will be submitted all examination papers of candidates' grading.

The Senate on Friday refused by a vote of 25 to 36 to recommit the Inter-State Commerce Bill for conference, and subsequently passed it by 43 to 15. The affirmative vote consisted of 23 Republicans and 20 Democrats. Three Democrats voted in the negative. The House will adopt the conference report by a large majority.

The House on Wednesday passed the Tucker substitute for the Edmunds Mormon Bill. The bill makes the lawful husband or wife of any person prosecuted for bigamy, polygamy, or unlawful cohabitation a competent witness against the accused; provides for the registration of all marriages, making it a misdemeanor for any person to violate the provisions relative to such registration; annuls all Territorial laws providing for the identification of the votes of electors at any election, and also all laws conferring on the Territorial courts the power to determine divorce cases, and abolishes woman suffrage in the Territory. Penalties are prescribed for unlawful intercourse, and polygamy is defined as a marriage between one person of one sex and more than one person of another sex, and is declared to be a felony. The financial corporations known as the Church of Latter Day Saints and the Perpetual Emigration Fund Company are dissolved, and the Attorney-General is directed to wind them up by process of court; and all laws for the organization of the militia of the Territory and the creation of the Nauvoo Legion are annulled. Polygamists are made ineligible to vote, and a test oath is prescribed to all persons desiring to vote that they will obey the laws of the United States, and especially the laws in respect to the crimes defined in this and the original Edmunds act. The bill provides for the immediate appointment by the President of all judges and selectmen of the county and probate courts, and by the Governor of all justices of the peace, sheriffs, constables, and other county and district officers.

The House of Representatives has passed, by a vote of 222 to 26, the bill to create a Department of Agriculture and Labor. It passed on Wednesday a bill authorizing the appointment of an additional United States Judge in the Second Circuit, which includes New York, Connecticut, and Vermont.

In the House of Representatives on Friday Mr. Caldwell (Dem., Tenn.) submitted the conference report on the Electoral Count Bill, and it was agreed to without debate or division. The amendments of the House to the bill are substantially adopted, and the principal changes made in the text are in the nature of more definite statements touching the exclusive right of the States to determine what electoral returns shall be presented to Congress. What is known as the Oates amendment was also accepted by the Senate conferees. The effect of this amendment is to strike out of the Senate bill the clause which allowed the President of the Senate to announce the name of the successful candidate, and confine his functions to the mere announcement of the state of the vote, which will be regarded as sufficient to indicate the result.

The Senate Trade-Dollar Bill, with the amendment of the House Committee, was submitted to the House on Saturday morning. The silver men gave notice of a minority report, and say privately that they will oppose the bill to the end unless the House agrees not to interfere with the present purchases of silver bullion.

The House of Representatives on Monday, under a suspension of the rules, passed, by a vote of 179 to 76, the bill for the relief of dependent parents and honorably discharged soldiers and sailors who are now disabled and dependent on their own labor for support. Mr. Matson (Dem., Ind.) said that the total number of persons who would be benefited by the bill was estimated at 33,105, and the annual cost to the Government would not reach $6,000,000.

The bills granting pensions to Mrs. Logan and Mrs. Blair, widow of Gen. Frank Blair, were defeated on Tuesday in the House Committee on Invalid Pensions, the Democrats voting against them.

United States Senators were practically elected on Tuesday by the Legislatures of the several States in separate session as follows: Maine, Eugene Hale (Rep.); Delaware, George Gray (Dem.); Illinois, Charles B. Farwell (Rep.); Missouri, F. M. Cockrell (Dem.); Michigan, F. B. Stockbridge (Rep.); Minnesota, C. K. Davis (Rep.); Pennsylvania, M. S. Quay (Rep.); Connecticut, J. R. Hawley (Rep.). The contests are close and undecided in New York, New Jersey, Indiana, Nebraska, Massachusetts, and West Virginia.

The Democratic majority in the Indiana Senate on Monday evening unseated McDonald (Rep.) on the ground that he had used money in securing his election; and gave his seat to Brannowan (Dem.). This gives the Democrats two majority on joint ballot.

The Republican Senatorial caucus at Albany made no nomination on Monday night. The first ballot resulted: Miller 44, Morton 35, Hiscock 12; necessary to a choice 48. On a second ballot the only change was a transfer of one vote from Hiscock to Morton. The caucus then adjourned to meet on Tuesday night. The Democratic caucus nominated Smith M. Weed. In the Assembly and Senate on Tuesday the Republicans voted as they had in caucus, and the Democrats for Mr. Weed. There was consequently no election. Mr. Miller gained one vote in Tuesday night's caucus.

The annual report of the New York State Board of Charities shows that the value of the property devoted to charitable purposes on October 1, 1886, was $52,128,192.

At a meeting of the reform Democrats of Maryland in Baltimore on Wednesday night the following resolution was adopted: "That we heartily endorse the national Administration of President Cleveland in its efforts to secure reform in the currency and tariff reform, and also its civil-service reform, whenever it is carried into effect in its true spirit, but we are compelled to express our regret that in the State of Maryland the laws and rules establishing said reform are not administered in good faith, and that the Federal appointments in Maryland, with few exceptions, have been made in accordance with the spoils system in its worst form, which system the American people condemned in the election of President Cleveland himself."

Gov. Rusk of Wisconsin, in his biennial message to the Legislature, said: "With those agrarian and socialistic theories of fanciful society that deny the right of private property, or of each individual to full protection in the enjoyment and control of all his lawful earnings, whether obtained by his own labor or by contract, we can have no sympathy. They are as un-American as monarchy, and as treasonable as secession. They contemplate the destruction of both justice and liberty, and would accomplish the destruction of both if their application to existing society were seriously attempted. We are not prepared as American citizens to even consider a change in our form of Government. Republican institutions and individual liberty go hand in hand, and must and will be loyally maintained."

Judge Pratt of Brooklyn on Thursday evening denied the application for a stay of proceedings in the case of ex-Alderman Arthur J. McQuade. He was taken to Sing Sing on Monday.

Owing to a strike of coal-handlers in this city and shipping points tributary to it, a coal famine is threatened.

The Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn, who has been suspended from his pastoral functions at St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church, in this city, on account of his advocacy of Henry George's doctrines, was succeeded on Saturday by the Rev. Arthur Joseph Donnelly, for thirty years pastor of St. Michael's Church, at Ninth Avenue and Thirty-first Street. The congregation have held an indignation meeting.

Jonas Gilman Clark, the wealthiest citizen of Worcester, Mass., has announced his intention of founding in that city an institution for the promotion of learning in all its higher branches, to be called Clark University. He will start it with an endowment of $1,000,000.

Mrs. Abby Kelley Foster, widow of Stephen S. Foster, the anti-slavery agitator, died in Worcester, Mass., on Friday. She was born at Pelham, Mass., January 15, 1811. Her parents were descendants of Irish Quakers, and she was educated at a Friends' school, and became a teacher. At the age of twenty-six she resigned her position as a teacher, and started out as an anti-slavery lecturer, being among the first women to address mixed audiences in favor of abolition. She suffered many indignities. In December, 1845, she married Stephen S. Foster in Pennsylvania, and was in full accord with his advanced opinions, speaking with him for many years. Their home was on a farm near Worcester up to Mr. Foster's death some years ago. Mrs. Foster necessarily took an active interest in woman suffrage, and also became a pronounced Prohibitionist. In private life she was amiable and unassuming. Her last work was the preparation of material for a biographical sketch of her husband on Tuesday of last week. She has led a quiet and invalid life during recent years.

Henry Brewster Stanton died on Friday of pneumonia, in this city, in the eighty-second year of his age. He was a native of Connecticut. His early education was acquired in the district schools. In 1826 he removed to Rochester, N. Y., where he wrote for a newspaper, entered politics as a Whig, and became Deputy County Clerk. Then he studied in Lane Seminary, Cincinnati, intending to enter the ministry. The anti-slavery agitation diverted his course, and, as general agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, he travelled all through the Northern States and in some of the border States, delivering speeches. In many instances the meetings which he addressed were broken up by mobs. He attended the World's Anti-Slavery Convention in London in 1840, and spoke in most of the large cities of Great Britain and Ireland. During the years 1838–1840 he was active in the movement to form the abolitionists into a compact political party, which was resisted by Garrison and others, and resulted in a lasting dissension in their ranks. After this he acted with the Liberty party, and then joined the movement to establish the Republican party. Meanwhile he had studied law, and practised it with success, at first in Boston and afterwards at Seneca Falls, N. Y. He was twice elected to the New York State Senate. When Horace Greeley was editor of the *Tribune*, Mr. Stanton wrote for that paper, and for the last eighteen years he had been a member of the editorial staff of the *Sun*. In the latter part of his life his political affiliations were with the Democratic party. Mr. Stanton married in 1840 Miss Elizabeth Cady of Johnstown, N. Y., daughter of Daniel Cady, an eminent lawyer.

Prof. Edward Olney of the University of Michigan, the author of a complete series of text-books and one of the best-known educators in the West, was found dead at his home in Ann Arbor on Sunday. He was sixty years of age.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gen. W. B. Hazen, the Chief Signal Officer, died in Washington on Sunday evening. He had been out of health for some time. Gen. Hazen was born in Vermont in 1830, and was graduated from West Point in 1855. He first served against the Indians, was later Assistant Professor of Military Tactics at West Point, and served through the war for the Union. He was appointed Chief Signal Officer in 1880.

Prof. Edward Livingston Youmans, the distinguished writer on scientific subjects, died in this city on Tuesday at the age of sixty-five. He established the *Popular Science Monthly* in 1872, and has since been its editor, assisted in recent years by William J. Youmans. For nearly forty years Prof. Youmans has held intimate relations with the publishing house of D. Appleton & Co., and it is understood that his influence had much to do with making the publication of scientific works a leading feature of the firm's business. Through him Herbert Spencer's works were first published in this country. Prof. Youmans was a personal friend of Mr. Spencer, and was well known to scientific men in all parts of Europe. He projected in 1871 the "International Scientific Series," arranging for the publication of the works in New York, London, Paris, and Leipsic, with a subsequent extension of the system to Milan and St. Petersburg. He was the author of a 'Class Book of Chemistry,' 1852; 'Alcohol and the Constitution of Man,' 1853; 'The Chemical Atlas,' with text, 1855; 'The Handbook of Household Science,' 1857; 'The Correlation and Conservation of Forces,' 1864; and 'The Culture Demanded by Modern Life,' 1867.

FOREIGN.

The debate on the German Army Bill was continued in the Reichstag on Wednesday. Herr Hasenclever declared on behalf of the Socialists that they would oppose every increase of the army. He vehemently criticised the contemptuous manner in which the Chancellor refered to the Reichstag, and said that in every other Parliament in the world a minister who so treated the majority would be forced to resign. The Chairman called Hasenclever to order. Both Hasenclever and Windthorst reproached Bismarck for his blunt explanation of German and French relations, which they said would excite instead of calm France. Bismarck made no reply.

Prince Bismarck made another notable speech in the Reichstag on Thursday, in the course of which he said: "The papers even ask us to use our soldiers to bar Russia's road to Constantinople. To do this would, perhaps, be in England's interest. But we have a difficult task to maintain peace and act permanently as moderator between two Powers, both our friends. Had I acted in 1867, at the epoch of the Luxemburg question, not as mediator, but in the manner in which I have been asked to do now, I should not have had to meet one bloody war alone, but many. In years to come, if Russia attacks us, then we must and shall defend ourselves to the last drop of blood. As matters stand, Russia has no cause to attack us, nor have we any cause to attack Russia. It is just as little conceivable that the Poles would involve us in war with Russia, for it would be very doubtful whether they would profit by Russian victory. I fail to understand how the same party should, on the one hand, seek to involve us, while on the other hand they would refuse or curtail the means of war. The comparison which has been drawn between our treaty with Italy in 1866 and the agreement of the King of Hanover with Napoleon does not hold good. According to the latter the Hanover Legion was only to act in the event of the cession of the left bank of the Rhine. You found no analogous clause in our treaty with Italy. There could never have been a question of the cession of German territory. Nor is it possible to show the existence of any understanding with Italy bearing the slightest resemblance to that between George V. and Napoleon III."

On the reassembling of the Reichstag on Friday Herr von Stauffenberg's amendment limiting the duration of the bill to three years was carried, the vote being 186 to 154. The Conservatives, Imperialists, and National Liberals voted with the minority. The Socialists and most of the Alsatian members abstained from voting. Prince Bismarck immediately read an imperial message dissolving the Reichstag. An imperial decree was issued on Friday afternoon, fixing February 21 for the holding of general elections for members of the new Reichstag.

The publication in Paris of the full text of Prince Bismarck's speeches in the Reichstag is tending to alter the tone of public opinion regarding his utterances. The Chancellor is charged with brutality, and with endeavoring to provoke a war with France. The principal result will be to strengthen Gen. Boulanger's demand for military credits. The War Minister, in order to avoid a conflict with his colleagues, has consented to accept a credit of 87,500,000 francs as sufficient for the present year; but his original demand for 325,000,000 francs remains his estimate on paper.

M. Floquet, on assuming the chair of President in the French Chamber of Deputies on Thursday, said he hoped that wise concord and a spirit of compromise would prevail among the members of the Chamber, who, he hoped, would all be animated by patriotic emulation to work for the progress of national institutions, in the first rank of which the Government placed the army. This declaration was received with applause. Continuing, M. Floquet said: "When, without distinction of party, we follow with equal solicitude the earnest efforts of the valiant youth of France, and when with unanimous impulse we accept every sacrifice to increase our country's power, we do not feel agitated by feverish impatience or desire. Only with tranquil persevering shall we place ourselves in position to fulfil all our duties and secure for France the respect of all. The essential condition of that is peace, which we prize as highly as anybody in the world."

In a test vote on Monday in the French Chamber of Deputies, Premier Goblet was sustained by 273 to 220.

The Russian budget for the past year shows a deficit of $26,113,310. The Minister of Finance proposes to raise $30,357,140 for extra expenditure by means of a loan.

Italy will act as mediator between Russia and Bulgaria, France having refused the duty.

In the recent Greek elections all the members of the Ministry were returned. The Government will have a majority of two-thirds in the new Chamber.

The British political world was startled on Wednesday morning by the announcement that Lord Iddesleigh had died suddenly. He fainted while ascending the stairs of Lord Salisbury's official residence in Downing Street as he was about to visit his Lordship. He was taken to the Prime Minister's room and expired in twenty minutes. His physician says: "Lord Iddesleigh for many years past has suffered with cardiac affections, which, while not placing his life in immediate peril, rendered the prospect of its sudden termination only too possible. He died of syncope." Lord Iddesleigh (Sir Stafford Henry Northcote) was born in London October 27, 1818, educated at Eton and Oxford, graduating first in classics, was private secretary to Mr. Gladstone in 1843-5, when the latter was President of the Board of Trade, and in 1851 succeeded to the Baronetcy of his grandfather. He assisted Sir C. E. Trevelyan in drawing up a report, in 1854, which led to the civil service being thrown open to public competition. He entered Parliament in 1855, was Financial Secretary to the Treasury in 1859, President of the Board of Trade in Lord Derby's third Administration in 1866, and Secretary of State for India from 1867 to 1868. He was a member of the Joint High Commission whose labors resulted in the Treaty of Washington in 1871. In 1874 he entered Disraeli's Cabinet as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and when Disraeli became a peer he succeeded him as leader of his party in the House of Commons, holding office until 1880. Sir Stafford led the Opposition during Gladstone's Ministry from 1880 to the formation of the Salisbury Ministry in June, 1885. Meanwhile Lord Randolph Churchill had come into notoriety by his frequent attacks on Mr. Gladstone, his breaches of party discipline, and his evident sympathy with certain phases of Radicalism. He gradually surrounded himself with a coterie of young men who aspired to turn Toryism in new directions. When Lord Salisbury formed his first Ministry (June, 1885), this element worked to have Sir Stafford Northcote "decently shelved." He was given the high Cabinet office of First Lord of the Admiralty, but was transferred to the House of Lords under the title of Earl of Iddesleigh, thus losing his leadership. In Salisbury's second Ministry (1886) he was made Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. This office he held until Lord Randolph Churchill's recent resignation from the Cabinet. In order to enable Lord Salisbury to form a coalition Cabinet with the Whigs, Lord Iddesleigh proffered his resignation. When the Prime Minister failed in that undertaking, Lord Iddesleigh considered himself entitled to his old portfolio, but was offered the Privy Seal. This he rejected, and retired from office under a strong sense of having been ill-treated.

It was announced in London on Tuesday that Saturday's Cabinet Council determined to bring in a bill at the beginning of the session to empower the Crown in certain cases to summon special jurors, and, if necessary, to change the venue, and also to confer on magistrates power to deal summarily with inciting to conspiracy, intimidation, and boycotting, the punishment for such offences not to exceed three months' imprisonment. The striking feature of this news is, that even a Tory Government no longer dares introduce a coercion bill for Ireland alone; for the new bill will be applicable to the whole United Kingdom.

Mr. W. H. Smith, First Lord of the Treasury, and Conservative leader in the House of Commons, has sent a circular to supporters of the Government asking them to make every effort to attend the opening of Parliament, as they will be invited to proceed directly to the consideration of questions of grave importance.

Mr. Goschen will contest the Exchange Division of Liverpool. He has issued an address in which he asserts that he is still a Liberal, and that he rallied to the support of the Government under the influence of deep conviction that the duty of men of all parties was to close up their ranks in the face of the common danger threatening the existence of the United Kingdom.

Mr. John Bright, in a letter declining an invitation to attend a meeting of the advocates of federation, on the ground that he has no sympathy with the objects and purposes thereof, says the federation project is mainly the offspring of the jingo spirit which clamors for a vast and continually widening empire, and seems almost ready to boast that the Empire can fight the world outside of its own limits. Mr. Bright says he would recommend sensible men to let the question rest

In the course of a speech in London on Thursday Mr. Henry M. Stanley said that he had decided to take the route by way of the Congo River as the best and most expeditious for the relief of Emin Pasha. Passage might be forced by other routes, but he pointed out that after the caravans had passed along them all those routes would be closed, while the Congo would always be open. The expedition would leave London, he said, January 20. Later reports of his intentions point to the Zanzibar route,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOR LEGISLATION.

AMONG the few labor problems which, nearly all persons are agreed, can be dealt with by legislation, are the two questions of child labor and weekly cash payments of the laborers' wages. No dispute, it is thought, can arise here as to either the wisdom or the efficiency of summary and stringent laws to limit the one and to enforce the other. England and America have gone far to restrict the employment of children in factories, and economists are at one with philanthropists in seeking to extend such legislation by advancing the limit of the child's lawful working age. Equally are they agreed as to the need of some means for abolishing store payments and monthly payments of wages, and substituting the cash system. If there are great difficulties surrounding both these reforms, as to the need of which there is little difference of opinion, should we wonder that the radical philosophers and orators who declaim about the wrongs of labor either take refuge in generalities, when asked to frame bills to carry their ideas into effect, or end in some ridiculous climax like Gov. Hill's recommendation that a new legal holiday be established, to be called Labor Day, and to be set apart for meditating on the subject of labor?

The two questions of child labor and weekly payments form the subjects of the annual report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the State of Connecticut. This Bureau has been in the charge of Prof. A. T. Hadley, as Commissioner, a trained thinker, investigator, and statistician, known to the country as the author of the best treatise on another vexed question, commonly called the Railroad Problem. It has been stated in the newspapers that Prof. Hadley's place as Commissioner "is wanted" by some politician or Walking Delegate, and that he is to be removed from office. However that may be, he has left on the public records of the State the most intelligent and painstaking examination of these two labor problems that has been supplied from any American source. That his sympathies are altogether with the laboring man is apparent on every page, but he does not fail to show that the reforms demanded, which upon the whole he favors, can be gained only after much pain and suffering among the wage workers themselves, and at the expense of the poorest and feeblest members of the class.

Connecticut passed a law last year prohibiting the employment of children under thirteen years of age. "If any law is to be obeyed," says the report, "this one ought to be." Yet there has been the greatest resistance to its enforcement. This has come from places where it would be least expected—that is, from the most needy operatives, "to whom the twenty-five cents a day that a child can earn by working in the mills is a present consideration that will outweigh anything else, who will not merely connive at evasions of the law, but make every effort to obstruct its enforcement." The case is cited of a twelve-year-old boy who was actually supporting a family on wages of five dollars a week earned without detriment to his own health and vigor. When the law came in force he was driven out of the factory by the State inspectors. This case is cited, not as an argument against the law, but as an index to the secret and powerful opposition to its enforcement among the operatives themselves. Prof. Hadley thinks, however, that "the general object to be obtained is so good that we must be prepared to enforce the law even though it may create great hardship in individual cases." He thinks that the thirteen years' limit can be enforced, and that possibly a fourteen years' limit might be, but that beyond this there would be grave doubt whether the State could insure obedience to it. As a general rule applicable to all labor laws, Prof. Hadley remarks that "when workmen are ready to make personal effort to enforce the law in their behalf, it is surprising how little legislation is needed." It is a great mistake to suppose that employers are the ones to suffer from the discontinuance of child labor, or that they are opposed to its abolition. The effective opposition comes from the weakest of the laboring class, since it is upon these that the heaviest burden of the change falls.

The larger part of the report is taken up with the questions of weekly payments, factorizing, store pay, the credit system, etc. Here we have not only a large array of statistical information and individual opinion from employers and employees, but also a careful collation of the laws of other States, all forming the foundation of a methodical treatment of the subject. The question is really that of the cash system against the credit system in factory labor. The cash system is the best, of course, because it dispenses with interest on money, and promotes habits of saving and thrift among the operatives. The laboring man is easily enticed, by the facility of obtaining credit, to spend a little more than he would if he had the money in his pocket and was obliged to pay cash down. There is a certain amount of sheer waste in the credit system that amounts to a loss to the whole community. Why not, then, pass a law requiring all employers to pay their workmen weekly? Three leading objections are urged by employers, who are, however, rather the small employers in the villages distant from banks than the large firms and corporations. In so far as there are hardships connected with the system of weekly payments, Prof. Hadley shows by a rigid analysis that they will fall upon the weaker firms, and by so much add to the predominance of the stronger—in other words, create monopolies or enlarge existing ones. The three objections are:

(1.) In many lines of business it is impossible to ascertain as often as once a week the amount which a man has earned; still less possible is it to pay him for work which is in an unfinished state.

(2.) In a still larger number of cases payment at frequent intervals, while not absolutely impracticable, seems to involve additional expense and inconvenience on account of the additional clerical force and work which it demands.

(3.) Other concerns, again, especially in the smaller towns, find it difficult to maintain the necessary cash reserve which weekly payment involves.

All these objections are examined by the light of the statistical and other information gained, and all are set aside as insufficient to rebut the arguments which are urged in support of the proposed law. But when we have got to the end, we find that we have not, after all, abolished the credit system, which is the real object of attack, since usurers will step in and lend money to improvident operatives at exorbitant rates of interest, if they are sure of getting paid in the end. This condition would be rather worse than the existing state of things. After considering all the pros and cons, Prof. Hadley concludes and recommends, as a measure better than any arbitrary requirement respecting weekly payments, that a law be passed exempting from legal attachment (prior to the obtaining of judgment and execution) the wages of laboring men, and he favors total rather than partial exemption. Already, exemptions, either total or partial, are embodied in the laws of one-half of the States of the Union. The protection which the right of attachment gives to the storekeeper being taken away, he will give no more credit except to those whose personal character entitles them to it. A law against the assignment of wages would be a necessary corollary, and these two measures are considered to be the only practicable and self-executing means to achieve the ends sought to be reached by the system of weekly payments.

JUDGE GRESHAM'S DECISION IN THE WABASH CASE.

IT will be worth the while of any person interested in railroad securities to read the decision of Judge Gresham in the case of the Wabash Railroad (now published in the *Federal Reporter*), resulting in the dismissal of the receivers for breach of duty to the bondholders, and the appointment of a thoroughly competent man, Judge Cooley, as receiver in their place.

It is not hard reading. Like the opinions of most clear-headed lawyers, it is perfectly comprehensible to any one who will have the patience to make himself acquainted with the details of facts. There are no citations of authorities, no parade of aphorisms about moral duties, or repetition of the utterances of other courts, to break the sequence of the argument. Indeed, there is scarcely room for argument—outside of a court-room, where everything seems arguable—on a question involving the claims of receivers, based on orders obtained from a facile judge to pay debts of the Missouri Pacific Railway by receivers' certificates; which were expected to have priority over the earliest mortgages of the Wabash; while threats of enforcing them as such were used to compel the bondholders to accept a lower rate of interest for bonds which were perfectly secure, if the rights of the holders were respected. These bonds the receivers had greatly depreciated in value, and had rendered apparently insecure by diverting the revenues of the road to other purposes than the payment of the interest on the earlier securities.

Without any rhodomontade, the opinion states that an order was obtained directing the receivers to pay a loss of more than three millions of dollars, incurred by the Missouri Pacific in operating the Wabash system as lessees, just as if it was a debt of the Wabash Railroad, when it was, in fact, that of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lessees to whom the profits would have accrued, and who therefore were responsible for the losses. The Court does not take the trouble to inquire whether such a loss was incurred, or whether it was only a question of book-keeping, but is satisfied to state that it was not a debt of the Wabash which the receivers paid.'

Next, it disposes of an order directing the receivers to pay $2,300,000 of notes of the Wabash Railroad endorsed by Solon Humphreys, one of the receivers, and by Gould, Dillon, and Sage, in the petition for which it appears that the notes were endorsed by sundry individuals of high credit and financial standing. "For the sake of *entire* frankness," says the Court, "the name of Solon Humphreys was disclosed as one of the endorsers, but the names of Gould, Dillon, and Sage, the other three endorsers, were withheld 'because of the *personal inconvenience and injury which might result* from the publicity given to their business affairs.'"

It next takes up a most charming arrangement by which the receivers supplied the railroad with coal from a mine owned by Humphreys, one of the receivers, Gould, Dillon, Sage, Hopkins, and Charles Ridgley, all directors of the Wabash, at a price which Judge Gresham could not approve of, and in relation to which the opinion says: "Men with a proper appreciation of their rights and of the rights of others—trustworthy men—are not apt to be found in such inconsistent relations. Gould, Humphreys, Dillon, Sage, Hopkins, and Ridgley are men of stern integrity if their interests in the coal company did not improperly influence their action as directors of the Wabash Company."

Next the Court holds that the minority bondholders who refused to be bullied into accepting a lower rate of interest on their bonds, "if they *selfishly* stood out against the committee's scheme, and would enter into the most complicated litigation ever known in the railroading of this country, with its exasperating delays and endless expense," can have ample redress; dismisses the receiver, and directs the mortgage to be foreclosed for the benefit of the minority bondholders, who have some rights which the law and receivers must respect.

There is certainly a directness and clearness of purpose in this decision which contrasts favorably with the labored productions of some judges, who cannot state the most self-evident result without leaning for support on the decisions of other courts. Probably instances of equally gross malversations of duty have come before other courts. The dealings of the receivers and the directors with their coal mine appear, perhaps, less offensive to those engaged in railroads than to this judge and other men; but the wholesale payment of the loss of one railroad out of the property in the hands of the receivers of another, belonging to the mortgage creditors, is certainly exceptional, and the payment of Humphreys's and Gould's endorsements of unsecured debts may be called unique. It is not often, however, that the offence is so distinctly stated, and the result made to follow so absolutely, and without any apology by the Court to offenders as high in financial circles as these.

With the order dismissing the receivers who did the wrong, and proceeding to give redress to the minority whose rights were threatened by the Purchasing Committee, the decision ends. For these latter persons there is redress, but what is the redress for those whose timidity or poverty compelled them to sell out at a depreciation? Probably none. That class of people go to the wall, or into smaller rooms and garrets, and trouble syndicates no more in this world.

HOW THE PEOPLE VOTED.

THE Republican press, and that part of the Democratic press whose happiness is increased by any indication that it thinks it can discover of a lack of popular support of President Cleveland, made much use, immediately after the November elections, of the discovery that the Democratic majority in the next House of Representatives would not be so large as is the majority in the present one. No mention was made, of course, of the fact that, at the Congressional election that follows a Presidential election, it has almost uniformly been the case that the representation in the popular legislative body of the party in power has been decreased, and especially was there an omission of any presentation of the vote of the people by States. The official canvass in many of the States is made with deliberateness, and it was not until the announcement was made on Monday of the official vote of Texas that a presentation of the State statistics could be made in official form. Now that they are at hand they are worthy of inspection.

Twenty-four States voted last November for State officers at large. Of these, the official vote of all but one—Colorado—has been declared. There being practically no opposition tickets in either Delaware or South Carolina, and only a judicial contest in North Carolina, these States are omitted from the tables of comparison. The pluralities of the heads of the other State tickets compare as follows with the pluralities for Presidential candidates in 1884; all the States not marked with an asterisk elected a Governor last year:

PLURALITIES.

	1886		1884	
	Rep.	Dem.	Rep.	Dem.
Cal	.....	652	13,128	
Conn	.....	1,898	.....	1,276
*Illinois	34,705	.....	25,118	
*Indiana	3,319	.....	.....	6,427
*Iowa	14,712	.....	19,773	
Kansas	33,918	.....	64,274	
Mass	9,463	.....	24,372	
Michigan	7,730	.....	3,308	
Minn	2,600	.....	41,620	
Missouri	.....	50,635	.....	33,059
Neb	23,300	.....	22,521	
Nevada	594	.....	1,615	
N. H	485	.....	4,066	
N. J	.....	8,020	.....	4,412
*N. Y	.....	7,818	.....	1,047
*Ohio	11,781	.....	31,802	
Pa	42,851	.....	61,019	
Tenn	.....	16,801	.....	9,180
Texas	.....	163,540	.....	125,301
Wis	18,718	.....	14,698	
Total	204,176	249,364	327,314	180,702
Net	.....	45,188	146,612	

The changes which this table presents are very striking. It will be seen that the Republican majorities in 1886 show a loss of 123,138, while the Democratic majorities show a gain of 68,662, making a total Democratic gain (or Republican loss) of 191,800.

The total Republican and Democratic vote in the years named was as follows:

	1886		1884	
	Rep.	Dem.	Rep.	Dem.
Cal	84,318	84,970	102,416	89,288
Conn	56,920	58,818	65,923	67,199
Illinois	275,366	240,661	337,469	312,351
Indiana	231,922	228,603	238,463	244,990
Iowa	180,309	165,597	197,089	177,516
Kansas	149,615	115,697	154,406	90,132
Mass	122,346	112,883	146,724	122,352
Michigan	181,518	173,788	192,669	189,361
Minn	107,064	104,464	111,685	70,065
Missouri	178,490	229,125	202,929	235,988
Neb	75,956	52,656	76,912	54,391
Nevada	6,463	5,869	7,193	5,578
N. H	37,819	37,334	43,249	39,183
N. J	101,919	109,939	123,336	127,778
N. Y	460,636	468,454	562,001	563,048
Ohio	341,095	329,314	400,082	368,280
Pa	412,485	369,634	473,804	392,785
Tenn	109,837	126,638	124,078	133,258
Texas	65,236	228,776	93,141	225,309
Wis	133,247	114,529	161,157	146,459
Total	3,312,561	3,357,749	3,814,726	3,655,111

An analysis of this last table shows that, while the Republican vote of 1886 fell off in the twenty States 502,165 as compared with that of 1884, the Democratic vote suffered a loss of only 342,550. Thirteen of these States gave a plurality for Blaine in 1884, and seven of them gave a plurality for Cleveland. In nine of the Republican States the Democrats made gains in 1886, and in a tenth (Wisconsin) the Republican candidate, as is acknowledged, received many votes outside of his party because of his firm stand against the rioters last summer. Every one of the seven States that were Democratic in 1884 increased the Democratic majority last year save one, viz., Indiana. If the Blaine press or the anti-Cleveland Democratic press can find in these figures any grounds for thinking that public opinion is shaping itself in favor of a spoils ticket in 1888, they are welcome to make their plans accordingly.

We add a fuller comparative table of the Prohibition vote of 1884 and 1886 than has been published:

	1886.	1884.
California	6,432	2,920
Connecticut	4,691	2,305
Illinois	19,527	12,074
Indiana	9,185	3,028
Iowa	578	1,472
Kansas	8,094	4,495
Massachusetts	8,251	9,923
Michigan	25,333	18,403
Minnesota	18,966	4,684
Missouri	3,504	2,153
Nebraska	8,175	2,899
Nevada	.....	.....
New Hampshire	2,132	1,571
New Jersey	19,808	6,153
New York	36,414	24,999
Ohio	28,982	11,069
Pennsylvania	32,422	15,283
Tennessee	.....	1,131
Texas	19,186	3,534
Wisconsin	17,089	7,656
Total	268,769	135,752

Here is an increase of nearly 100 per cent. in the vote of this third party in two years, and an increase so evenly distributed that it has taken place in sixteen out of twenty States.

THE SHARPLES PORTRAITS.

THE comfortable assurance, under which many of our citizens have rested, that we were soon to possess veritable treasures in the so-called Sharples portraits of Washington and his family, now on exhibition and for sale in this country, has received a severe shock from the report on these portraits presented to the Massachusetts Historical Society on January 13 by Mr. Francis Parkman, chairman of a committee appointed by that society to investigate the historical value of these pictures. In November last, Major Walter, who represents the family in England now owning the portraits, and who has published a large and elegant volume entitled 'Memorials of Washington' (see No. 1114 of the *Nation*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in support of their claim to authenticity, appeared before the Historical Society with a view to obtaining its backing in his appeal to the national Government at Washington to purchase the portraits for the nation. The result is the present report of Mr. Parkman, which will not be pleasant reading to Major Walter or his coadjutors. As a model of quiet and yet crushing sarcasm it is as good as Bentley's essay on the letters of Phalaris.

The claim in question rests mainly on letters published by Major Walter, which are ascribed to Washington, to the artist Sharples, and to "good Robert Cary," the London banker, who figures as "the friend, benefactor, and admirer" of Washington. Of the Washington letter, which has no date, Mr. Parkman says:

"Its style bears no resemblance to the well-known style of the alleged writer. It bears, however, a striking resemblance to the very peculiar style of Major Walter, which is marked by frequent and conspicuous solecisms. One of these is his often repeated use of the verb *to name* in the sense of *to mention*. Washington also is made to say, 'I have been solicited *to name* that, if Mr. Sharples thinks of returning to this country, a good opportunity would be offered to bring them [the pictures] out.' And again, a few lines below, 'My wife declines to join in asking your consent—I have undertaken simply *to name* it.' The letter begins with thanks for two jars of pickled tripe, sent as a present by Cary, and the illustrious writer adds: 'Dental infirmity impels us caring for this necessary item in our domestic commissariat'—a sentence eminently Walterian, as is also the injunction that Sharples shall be required to paint copies of his portraits 'in the best manner of his *capability*.'"

The original letter from which these precious extracts are taken is said by Major Walter to have been destroyed at Washington's own request "for politica reasons." No explanation is given of the sudden appearance in print of a letter which was destroyed in the last century. Another of Major Walter's favorite expressions is the use of *evidence* as a verb; and Sharples in his letters follows his modern admirer, and says: "General Hamilton *evidences* more what painters would call 'background knowledge.'" This and the other phrase *to name* have infected to a disgraceful extent the styles of Washington Irving, Hawthorne, Emerson, Macready, Col. Trumbull, Albert Gallatin, and others, as they appear in their letters quoted by Major Walter.

But the gem of the whole collection of letters is that of the banker Cary, quoted by Major Walter on p. 242 of his 'Memorials.' "There," says Mr. Parkman, "we look in vain for the characteristic traces of Major Walter's pen." But, "by a remarkable coincidence," the sentiments of the old London banker and even his very words reappear in a speech made by the Irish orator Charles Phillips in 1814 on Dina's Island, in the lakes of Killarney. We give the letter and the speech in parallel columns:

THE BANKER CARY.	CHARLES PHILLIPS.
"May not the follies of the Old World at some distant day inter all the pride of its power and the pomp of its civilization, and may not human nature find her destined renovation in the empire created by Washington! May not the glory of past great ones prove to be legendary traditions! The monumental record of natural rise and natural ruin proclaims that no splendor of achievement, no solidity of success, can insure to empire the permanence of its possession. Troy thought so once, yet the land of Priam lives only in song! Thebes thought so once, yet her hundred gates have crumbled and her tombs are as the dust they were destined to commemorate. So thought Palmyra! Where is she? So thought Demosthenes and the Spartans, but Leonidas is trampled by the timid slave. The days of their glory are as if they never had been, and the Island that was then a mere speck, rude and neglected in the barren ocean, now rivals all the wealth of their commerce, the glory of their names, the fame of their philosophy, the eloquence of their Senate, and the inspiration of their bards." ('Memorials of Washington,' p. 242.)	"Who shall say that when, in its follies or its crimes, the Old World may have interred all the pride of its power and all the pomp of its civilization, human nature may not find its destined renovation in the New? . . . When the glories of our name shall be but the legend of tradition, philosophy will rise again in the sky of her Franklin, and glory rekindle at the urn of her Washington. I appeal to history. Tell me, thou reverend chronicler of the grave, can ambition, wealth, commerce or heroism secure to empire the permanency of its possessions? Alas! Troy thought so once, yet the land of Priam lives only in song! Thebes thought so once, yet her hundred gates have crumbled and her monuments are as the dust they were vainly intended to commemorate! So thought Palmyra; but where is she? So thought the countries of Demosthenes and Leonidas; yet Sparta is trampled by the timid slave, and Athens insulted by the servile Ottoman. The days of their glory are as if they had never been; and the Island which was then a speck, rude and neglected in the barren ocean, now rivals the ubiquity of their commerce, the glory of their arms, the force of their philosophy, the eloquence of their Senate, and the inspiration of their bards."

All will agree with Mr. Parkman's remarks on this coincidence:

"If it is not likely that the 'plain London merchant'—the words are Major Walter's—would have poured himself out in this rhetorical strain, neither is it likely that the Irish orator had ever heard of Cary, or still less have got access to his private papers. On the other hand, it is very likely that the words of Phillips, which have been often printed, and which some of us will remember in the school-books of our boyhood, may have met the eye of Major Walter."

The report ends as follows:

"The Committee began their inquiry under a strong impression that the three portraits were what they were represented to be; but this was quickly removed on an examination of the evidence produced by Major Walter in proof of his assertions, since it is of such a character that, for reasons given above, and others almost equally cogent, they feel compelled wholly to reject it."

We trust that the authorities at Washington will take this document into serious consideration before they add these new treasures to the national gallery of historic portraits.

NEBULOUS ENGLISH POLITICS.

LONDON, January 1.

THE Queen's jubilee year is coming in like a lion. It is to be hoped that it will be true to the whole of the proverb, and go out like a lamb. At present we are in the region of storms, meteorological and social. The one hope of peace abroad lies in the fact that France and Germany, between whom lies the real point of disturbance, are each too strong to attack the other. Neither can get at the other. The frontier on either side of the Rhine is reported by experts to be impregnable, save by the invasion of the neutral territories of Belgium and Switzerland. Austria is too weak to challenge Russia alone, and Germany would certainly not see Austria attacked and dismembered. If England's interest in the Bulgarian and Eastern questions is, as Lord Salisbury contends, too slight to make it necessary to interfere as a principal in the controversy, most persons will be disposed to agree with Lord Randolph Churchill that she ought not to interfere at all. However, reason and calculation speak only in the beginning of a quarrel, or before the quarrel has begun. Passion and accident usually decide the actual entrance into a fray, and, like love in the poem, will find out the way.

At home, politics, like the streets, are in a state of fog, which only now and then lifts. Statesmen, like pedestrians, are involved in "a London particular," and accidents and collisions abound. When I last wrote to you, I mentioned the opinion entertained by some very close observers that Lord Randolph Churchill's retirement from the Government would not be long delayed, and that before the session was many weeks old he would have found a pretext for withdrawing himself. In the view of some well-placed critics it was thought that the opposition of his colleagues, or, if they were won over or bullied into acquiescence, of a large number of the Conservative party, to closure by a simple majority would give him the pretext which he desired. But he has been in too great a hurry to wait. I referred also to the opinion that an understanding existed between Lord Randolph Churchill and Mr. Chamberlain, and that they would find an opportunity of coming together. This, too, has been confirmed. Mr. Chamberlain, who could not come to London to attend the Unionist meeting over which Lord Hartington presided, was called to town, no doubt on purely private business, a day or two before Lord Randolph exploded his resignation on the public in the columns of the *Times*. He dined with the Chancellor of the Exchequer—as Lord Randolph Churchill was then and still is, and will be till his successor is appointed—in Connaught Place. There is reason to suppose that he knew what was going to happen. The speech which Mr. Chamberlain delivered in Birmingham on the day of the announcement scarcely affected surprise. The eulogy which he passed on Lord Randolph's democratic Toryism had all the air of being thought over beforehand, and of having been kept in reserve for the occasion. The relations between Lord Randolph and Mr. Chamberlain have been very close and intimate, off and on. Each has a strong admiration for the audacity and unscrupulousness, and an immense belief in the cleverness and the future, of the other. They have a good deal in common. Lord Randolph is a sort of Blenheim Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain is a sort of Brummagem Churchill. They are drawn together by the attraction which unites, not like to like, but like to difference. Personal and political quarrels have not been infrequent with them. They have attacked each other in the House, reciprocating accusations of treason and falsehood, to which neither of them is particularly sensitive. There have been seasons in which they have ceased to speak to each other; but the quarrels have been those of outraged affection, and have been followed by the renewal of love.

Another political revolution has been not less remarkable. Mr. Chamberlain has bitterly resented Mr. John Morley's claim to have a political soul of his own, and his daring to remain in a government which Mr. Chamberlain had quitted. In the political sense, Mr. Chamberlain believed that he had invented Mr. John Morley and patented him, and that no one else had a right to employ him. Their mutual criticism on public platforms has been of a more than sub-acid kind. Lord Randolph is supposed to cherish the same sentiment towards Mr. Henry Mathews, whom he brought into the Cabinet and made Home Secretary, and who has declined to follow Lord Randolph out of the Cabinet. To return to Mr. Chamberlain. His speech at Birmingham was interpreted as showing signs of a yielding or coming-on disposition, and Mr. Morley was authorized or felt himself at liberty to enter into negotiations with him. They have celebrated their personal reconciliation by going to the play together, and witnessing Mr. Irving's performance of the part of a politician able to give lessons to the most expert wire-puller and caucus manager. Whether a political understanding with a more considerable personage than Mr. John Morley will follow this personal reconciliation, is a question which is hidden in the bosom of the future and of Mr. Gladstone. If Mr. Gladstone can see his way to modifying and restricting his home-rule scheme so as to bring it within limits compatible with the maintenance of the United Parliament as established in the Act of the Union, and the authority of the Imperial Executive over every portion of the United Kingdom, the controversy, so far as Mr. Chamberlain and the Radical Unionists are concerned, would be at an end. There would still be room for a large devolution of properly Irish business to a National Council, with its own Executive acting in subordination to the Imperial Parliament and Executive. Mr. Chamberlain cannot go further than this without self-stultification. Mr. Gladstone, with no other inconsistency than is involved in a statesmanlike accommodation of himself to circum-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stances, might fairly take the result of the last general election as decisive against the form and mechanism of his scheme, and set about the task of adjusting it to the conditions imposed by the declared opinion of the nation. If Mr. Gladstone cannot bring himself to take this course, there seems to be little advantage in sanctioning his late Chief Secretary's explorations into Mr. Chamberlain's feelings and intentions. Even if Mr. Gladstone's personal objections were overcome, Mr. Parnell would have to be squared or otherwise operated on. The "gastric fever" of the Irish Parliamentary leader has happily been subdued, but there is reason to fear that the "complications" with which it was accompanied remain. Mr. Gladstone, however, might not be indisposed to welcome a reunion of the Liberal party which should put it into the position in which he invited the country to place it at the general election of 1885—a position in which, while prepared to listen to the suggestions of the Irish party, it should be numerically and therefore morally independent of them.

It is obvious from many public symptoms as well as privately notorious, that Mr. Chamberlain feels his position as a dissentient Liberal following the lead of Lord Hartington as unsuitable as Lord Randolph Churchill felt his democratic Toryism to be in the Conservative Cabinet of Lord Salisbury. He cannot cut the knot as Lord Randolph did, and must, therefore, do his best to untie it. It is doubtful whether anything could bring back Lord Hartington into the Gladstone fold. It was his vote, added to that of the peers, which defeated, in the penultimate Gladstone Cabinet, Mr. Chamberlain's proposal of a National Council for Ireland. In the Cabinet deliberations of Mr. Gladstone's Government, Lord Hartington has always been much stronger in resistance than in his platform and Parliamentary declarations. It is only the personal authority of Mr. Gladstone which has kept Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain in the same Government. It is doubtful whether they will ever belong again to the same ministry. A formal coalition of Whigs and Conservatives may not be imminent. What is more likely is such a reconstitution of parties as will rank the party of semi-socialistic Radicalism and experimental Democracy with Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. John Morley, and very possibly Lord Randolph Churchill, on the one side, and the adherents of the older political economy and the traditional politics of England—whether so-called Whig or Conservative—on the other.

For the moment, however, the question is, Will Lord Salisbury's Government last, and of whom is it to consist? This will be known to you in all its details so many days before this letter can be in your hands, that it would be challenging the worst fate that can imperil even a prophet, whether in his own country or in another, to venture on prediction. Lord Randolph may be in again and out once more before Parliament meets. There may be a large reconstruction of the Ministry or a paltry patching of it. The one thing certain is that there can be no result entirely satisfactory. Lord Randolph Churchill can only be an element of disturbance and distrust to any ministry which he may join or rejoin. Lord Hartington and his friends have elected to be independent auxiliaries of the Government. If Mr. Goschen were either now or in the course of a few weeks to be persuaded to come in as Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader in the House of Commons, he would be wholly out of harmony with the party which would vainly endeavor to follow him. His conservatism of the closet and of the city has nothing in common with the Conservatism of the Tory country gentleman and the Tory vestryman. In fact, there is scarcely the possibility of a real Conservative leader of the House of Commons. Such a man ought to unite the tact of the man of business, the good breeding of the country gentleman, and the combativeness of the prize-fighter. If Lord Salisbury could become Lord Robert Cecil again, the difficulty would be solved. But the House of Lords is like the other world—anybody may go there, nobody can come back from it. "Don't talk to me of Prime Ministers," said the late Sir George Lewis. "I can name half-a-dozen possible Prime Ministers. Tell me who your leader of the House of Commons is, and I will tell you how your Ministry will fare." For the moment, and probably for much longer than the moment, the policy of Lord Salisbury is reduced to the policy of keeping in—*j'y suis, j'y reste*—and of Lord Hartington of helping him to keep in. F. L.

THE LAND WAR IN IRELAND.

DUBLIN, January 4, 1887.

WHAT is known as the "Plan of Campaign"—that is, the united action of the tenants on each estate in demanding a reduction in rent proportioned to the fall in prices, and the payment, if the landlord refuses it, of the reduced rents to trustees, who are to use the fund to defend the tenants in case of legal proceedings—is an excellent substitute for the outrage, violence, tumult, and bloodshed which have characterized similar crises in past times. The plan has been entirely successful so far, for it has induced many landlords to recognize the inability of tenants to pay rents based on higher prices, and it has brought about many peaceful settlements. It is too soon to say how matters will end where the money refused by the landlord has actually been paid to trustees. A landlord with a long purse may possibly win; he may succeed in evicting some, and perhaps all, his tenants, if he perseveres to the bitter end; but it will only be at great money loss to himself.

There has been a good deal of discussion about the morality of the plan of campaign, much quibbling and sophistry. "Salus populi suprema lex" is, however, its one and ample justification. On the rejection by Parliament of Mr. Parnell's bill, a struggle of some kind was inevitable; it is better that it should be orderly and organized than spasmodic and accompanied with outrage, riot, and murder. The national programme will have gone far towards settling the question of the amount of rent to be paid, before the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the subject has framed its report. Meantime the situation between the Government and the Irish people is becoming more and more strained. The prosecution of Messrs. Dillon, Harrington, O'Brien, and others keeps the agitation in Ireland and the public interest in England alive. It should not be forgotten that the old Liberal party were just as ready as the present Government to resort to coercion, to make use of obsolete laws, to pack juries, and even to transgress the law in their efforts to put down agitation and to suppress the national spirit. But the old Liberal party is dead and gone, though in Ireland we have hardly realized the change effected by the last extension of the franchise. Those who in English and imperial politics are Liberals are pleased that the Conservatives should now be ringing the chapel bell, and keeping the Irish question to the front as they are doing. They are by their present policy helping towards a speedy settlement of the Irish land and home-rule questions; the issues to be settled are becoming narrowed and more clearly defined day by day. The Irish question will be as prominent next session as it ever was, and an insuperable obstacle to English and imperial legislation. English and Irish Conservatives have, it is evident, no policy of any kind on the subject, and the principle of Gladstone's Home-Rule Bill still holds the field.

Many stanch adherents of the national cause objected strongly to the details of that measure, and condemned the eagerness of the Irish members to accept it. Those who did so are as anxious for a real union between England and Ireland as any persons can be, but think that any imperial control in purely local questions will be a cause of friction, and will lay the foundation for a disturbance of friendly relations. A fallacious phraseology is current, and persons agree in words while they really mean very different things. "The supremacy of the Imperial Parliament is to be maintained." "Certainly," say both parties; but one person means that Parliament at Westminster is to be supreme to the extent of interfering, overseeing, and controlling all things as at present, while the other means that the Imperial Parliament is to be supreme in imperial matters only. Home rule would be a delusion if any English power of interference in purely Irish matters should remain. In peace and war, in colonial policy, in foreign relations, the Imperial Parliament should be supreme, but it should not have power to interfere in questions of local government or taxation, education, or administration.

A new weekly paper, to be called *North and South*, is about to be published in Dublin. It is intended to advocate principles of reconstruction and conciliation on the platform of home rule. Its policy will be a positive one, and not merely one of negation and attack on the enemy. C. H. Oldham, Hon. Sec. to the Protestant Home-Rule Association, has accepted the editorship. This is a guarantee that the paper will be free from all sectional taint, that it will be characterized by vigor and originality. In the political turmoil of the last six years, attack and defence have had exclusive occupation of men's minds. It is a good sign that the attention should now be directed to a consideration of our future and permanent organization. The landlord party is of course the one obstacle to home rule, but many landlords recognize that as inevitable. Some acquiesce passively in the national programme; others are only waiting in hopes that they may divest themselves of their landed property before joining the national ranks. The agrarian is inseparable from the home-rule question, and the leaders of both Conservative and Liberal parties are evidently prepared to terminate the land war by purchasing the landlords' interests. The only difference between them is, how and on what terms it is to be done. The Conservative plan is to adhere to the present system, by which each tenant purchaser is the direct debtor of the English Treasury. The Liberals would hand over the working of the scheme, and the collection of the interest, to an Irish Government which should be responsible for the repayment as a whole of whatever loans were made for this purpose. As long as the scheme is looked upon and worked as a political matter, and not on commercial principles, it will be unsound, and the taxpayer's money will be in danger. The Conservatives' plan is fraught with danger to the public purse, for with them the theory still prevails that the Irish landlord has been plundered, and that restitution is due to him. Hence the present Land Purchase Act was passed more as a landlords' relief bill than as a measure of permanent settlement.

In such a scheme the security of the public purse should be the first and paramount consideration. The danger lies not in the gross amount to be advanced, but in the possibility of imprudent lending of many small amounts. It is far more easy for administrators to say yes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than no when it is a question of lending or giving other persons' money. It is unlikely that the Conservatives will be able to carry a vote of more money for this purpose on the present lines. They opposed Mr. Gladstone's bill in the alleged interest of the taxpayer, and however ready they may be to eat their words, they could not succeed in the face of Liberal and Radical opposition. John Morley, the *bête noire* of the landlords, is an uncompromising advocate of the necessity of a Land Purchase Bill. Over and over again he has stated in public that England was bound by every obligation of honor to the landlords to deliver them, as far as is compatible with public economy, from their evil plight; that she is bound, too, in setting up a government in Ireland, not to leave it with the burden of the present land system on its shoulders. Such a Government, he said, should have a fair start; it could not, however, until the relations of landlord and tenant were brought by some means or other into a more satisfactory state.

The prospect, then, before the Irish landlords is that of being bought out, but no longer on their own terms. In many cases they can now practically fix these. "Pay up an impossible rent, and all arrears, or buy at my price," are the alternatives given to the poorest occupiers. This is represented as a contract freely entered into, and as such the price is to be taken, according to the landlords, as the fair value of the land. Such contracts are often made without the exercise of any open duress, but with a great deal of undue influence. Any extension of the purchase system will probably include powers being given to both landlord and tenant to compel the other to sell or buy, as the case may be; the price to be fixed judicially or by arbitration. Copyhold legislation in England affords a precedent for this. That tenure having been found so inconvenient as to be contrary to the public welfare, laws and amending laws of a permissive character were passed to facilitate its abolition. Finally, and in spite of outcries of confiscation and interference with sacred rights, the present law was passed, by which either party can compel the enfranchisement of the copyhold lands. The question of the abolition of the Irish landlord and tenant system differs in principle from this only in its financial aspect. That, however, is one of the great stumbling-blocks to the average Englishman. As much money is spent annually and unnoticed in maintaining the landlord system as would carry on a considerable war; but the idea of voting directly a bulk sum for the termination of the war, and putting an end to the annual drain, has not yet been assimilated in England. A section of the Radical party is strongly opposed to any such use of the imperial credit, but if a system of prudent lending can be insured, and if the English taxpayers can be shown to be fully safeguarded, it is unlikely that this section would persevere in their opposition.

A Land Valuer.

Correspondence.

THE INTER-STATE COMMERCE BILL.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In this letter I shall try to point out what I believe to be the most important of the effects which would follow enforcement of the Inter-State Commerce Bill, and yet one which has well-nigh escaped attention.

If the short-haul rule is enforced, the result will be a vast system of local discrimination, too complex to be described. In the first place, it makes a discrimination as between the towns and the great trade centres. Obviously, the railroads will drop that part of their business which pays least, namely, the business from great cities, in order to preserve the more paying portion. This will not benefit the small cities particularly, but it will injure the great cities. *The result would be a rise in the average rates of freight.* This may be surprising, but it is none the less true, as the operation of a similar rule in Germany has, I believe, demonstrated. As regards the effect on our export trade, a striking example has been given by Commissioner Blanchard:

"The conference bill also absolutely prohibits taking grain, for example, from Kansas City to New York for direct Liverpool export, in national competition with the Black Sea and India, at even a fraction less than the charge to the residents of New York for grain there consumed. The former might be to the gain of every American interest involved and injure none."

Another authority points out that this provision would throw the carrying trade into the hands of the Canadian roads, which could put their through rates so low that the American roads would be compelled to drop their Chicago business altogether, in order to preserve the main body of their paying freight.

More important still, perhaps, though as yet hardly noticed, is the discrimination implied in the bill as between cities and sections having desirable water-communication and those which have not. In your issue of January 6, this appears clearly enough in the somewhat ingenuous remark of Mr. Nowell, that "The passage of this bill would make Duluth the great depot for Dakota wheat." This remark is followed up by the claim that "right then would commence the only real competition—that between carrying by water and by railroads." Why this is "the only real competition" is, I confess, as puzzling a question as why this competition should begin when one of the competitors is prevented from competing. Dakota wheat will still reach New York, whether this bill passes or not. It would practically take a very large army to prevent it. But I think it obvious that if the short-haul principle—which implicitly bases rates on distance—were put in force, "not a grain of Dakota wheat will reach the mechanics of New York." Under our present system, as Mr. Atkinson has beautifully shown in his "Distribution of Products," "the annual ration of 1,000 people can be placed in the city of New York from a point 1,700 to 2,000 miles distant, with an exertion of human labor equivalent to that of four men working one year in producing, milling, and moving the wheat." This rule simply multiplies the necessary labor.

If we examine the newspapers, we find evidence that this aspect of the bill is attracting attention, particularly in trade centres without water competition. The Cincinnati *Times-Star* says, "Mr. Reagan would sacrifice the commercial interest of the entire West in order that Galveston may roll in high clover. He is a patriot, perhaps, but his patriotism flows in a narrow channel." The Nashville *Union* says, "We cannot believe . . . that any member of Congress from Tennessee, Alabama, or Georgia . . . will vote for it. . . . *Whenever he does, he signs the death-warrant of his section of country.*"

It may be admitted that the enforcement of this rule—a very different thing from enacting it into law—would benefit Duluth, Galveston, New Orleans, and the South Atlantic ports, though at the expense of the rest of the country. It may even benefit Chicago, St. Louis, and Toledo, though that is more doubtful. But it cannot, it seems to me, be doubted that it would be a crushing blow to Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, the Pacific States, great parts of Texas, Dakota, and the Middle States. It would destroy nearly all those industries (or at least severely cripple them) which depend on a wide distribution, and for which extraordinarily cheap rates are as necessary as they are for coal. New York would be affected in both ways—both as a receiver of products and as a distributor of manufactures—and would probably suffer more by the actual enforcement of the short-haul principle than any other city in the country.

If any one has the fatuity to believe that the Commission created by the act would remedy the evil effects of it—if, like Mr. Richard T. Ely, he does not believe in experience as a guide, but thinks himself warranted in expecting what never yet has happened—there is still a reply. If the Commission is to dispense with the principle in these cases, does it not show there is something wrong in it? If the Commission is to let the necessities of traffic prevail in some cases, why should this not continue to be the rule in all cases as it is now? But the important thing is the actual probable result. This is, that the Commissioners—being human—would dispense with the rule wherever most "pressure" was brought to bear. Powerful centres like New York would be relieved of its operation very soon, while sections like the far West would be helpless. There would be combinations in the Commission and in Congress to favor certain cities, just as is now the case with the River and Harbor Bill. Does not this statement appeal to the common sense of the readers of the *Nation?*

Lastly, I wish to give two instances of the working of the commission system which have come within my own experience. In Michigan the law provides that the Commissioner of Railroads shall "approve" the maps of proposed railroads. In one case the Commissioner arbitrarily refused his approval, by an arrangement he had made with other railroads for that purpose; in the other case, another Commissioner demanded (through an indirect channel, of course) $4,000 as his price for approving the map. In the present state of public sentiment there is no remedy for such things as this. Anybody who is "agin' rail'odes" is right, and is the people's friend.

If this bill becomes law, it will be the worst instance of tyranny ever afforded by our Government—one which the framers of the Constitution could not apprehend specifically, but which they did all in their power to prevent.

Charles S. Ashley.

Toledo, Ohio, January 9, 1887.

THE SUPPLY OF TEACHERS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I have been much interested in reading your recent articles on the excessive number of teachers annually graduated at the New York Normal College—the more so because the same complaint is made with equal reason by other observers in many different localities. There is, however, a way out of the difficulty which has not yet been suggested, but which I feel sure you will heartily approve. It cannot for a moment be maintained that the supply of good teachers, either in New York city or elsewhere, is equal to the need. One of the best authorities on the subject in the country, Mr. C. W. Bardeen of Syracuse, N. Y., has truly said that there is at the present time no calling in which the very best service secures so little pecuniary remuneration, and the poorest service is so well paid, as in the teacher's. It is a notorious and disgraceful fact that the majority of teachers in the country secure and retain their places on other grounds than their ability to teach. If the authorities would devote all their attention to securing the best possible service for their money, we should soon cease to hear complaints that more teachers were graduated than could find employment.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is nothing dangerous in encouraging the best and brightest pupils in our public schools to prepare themselves to become teachers. All we need is discrimination. At the present time thousands are pushing their way into the ranks of teachers, not because of any special aptitude or ability, but because they think they have the friends or influence to secure an appointment if they can only pass the required examination. Arbitrarily cutting down the numbers of those who are trying to prepare themselves will, under the present system, afford no proper relief. The unworthy and inefficient will struggle no less to obtain the desired diploma, trusting to influence and importunity to procure situations; and it is a significant fact that, of those who go through the prescribed courses, the best qualified are the ones who most easily allow themselves to be driven off into other vocations.

Let the business of making the appointments be intrusted to those who will recognize no title to favor except genuine desert, and the unqualified and inefficient will not be long in learning the hopelessness of their effort. I speak from long experience and wide observation when I say, that in no department of our public work is there more pressing need of reform than in the method of selecting and appointing teachers in the public schools. If you can bring your public to recognize this fact, and to sustain those authorities who seek to discriminate only on merit, you will find that the normal schools in New York and throughout the country do not furnish half enough graduates. B.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., January, 1887.

THE "ISSUING" OF SILVER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In reply to your remarks on my note, I should like to say that I spoke of "issuing" silver in order to show that my argument referred only to the silver actually forced into circulation, either bodily or by means of silver certificates. There is already a considerable amount of such silver, and unless the people shall allow the Treasury surplus to be further swollen, all silver coined hereafter will be added to this amount. I do not think any one supposes that the surplus will be allowed to reach and remain at a much higher point than it has already attained; and thus, in looking to the somewhat distant future—as Mr. St. John's proposition does—the part played by the piling up of silver dollars (unrepresented by paper) is practically eliminated. F. F.

BALTIMORE, January 14, 1887.

[We remarked that the argument of "F. F." in last week's *Nation* was "thus far inconclusive." He now supplies the missing link by giving the opinion that Congress will some day force all the silver dollars into circulation, as a portion of them have already been. We can find no warrant for the statement that any silver dollars have been forced into circulation. Those that have gone into circulation have been taken out voluntarily by people who could make use of them, and have all been taken at 100 cents gold each. It is hardly proper to call that a forcing process which comes about as a consequence of the retirement of national-bank notes and of small greenbacks. It is not that kind of forcing that "F. F." has in mind, but rather, we judge, some violent expulsive movement on the part of Congress. It is certainly well to keep the possibility of this in mind, but we should like to have the process described before considering measures to counteract it.—ED. NATION.]

THE PRESIDENT'S EXCUSE IN MICHIGAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nation* for January 6 is a criticism of the Administration for its appointments to Government offices in Detroit. The facts are as "W. E. H." states them, and it may be said of the whole State of Michigan that the civil-service-reform policy of President Cleveland is a flat failure. Is the Administration, however, justly to be blamed for this? The State of Michigan has not a representative in Congress who is not an open enemy of civil service reform. She has not a public man of prominence who gives the reform more than a qualified support. There is not a newspaper of influence in the State which honestly advocates it. Moreover, it is to be doubted whether Mr. Cleveland and his advisers could have found four men in Detroit, whose reputation and experience would justify their appointment to the important offices in question, who would unequivocally endorse the President's reform policy. Which, then, is at fault, the Administration or public sentiment?

Mr. Cleveland was elected to be the chief executive of the nation—a position of large and many-sided responsibilities. Is it to be expected or desired that he should wreck his Administration by a too close adherence to a policy in which he is not supported by the sentiment of his party, and for which he is only ridiculed by his opponents?

Of the prospects of civil-service reform it must be said that its ultimate success does not depend upon the favor of a single Administration, but upon an awakened and enlightened public sentiment. This is only to be attained by organized effort through the press, by public meetings, and by the active political exertions of the supporters of the reform. Is such an agitation going on at present? Or do reformers really believe that their end is to be gained by criticism of President Cleveland's well-meant but ineffectual endeavors to make a practical application of their teachings? Surely, they will not rest satisfied with the present inadequate law. Civil-service reform may not be said to be accomplished until all the minor officers of the Government are appointed under its rules, until every State government is administered upon its principles, and every municipal and county office feels the benefits of its system. Truly there remaineth yet much more land to be possessed, and it is for the reformers to enter and take possession.

WM. W. HUDSON.

DETROIT, January 14, 1887.

A STORY WITHOUT AN END.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you allow me to point out, through your columns, to the readers of the Annual which I have the honor to edit for Mr. T. Fisher Unwin, and which is republished in America by Messrs. Appleton, under the title 'The Witching Time,' that my contribution to it appears in the American edition without a tail? Messrs. Appleton have, inadvertently of course, sent the volume to press before they had received the proof of the last sheets of "Two of a Kind," and consequently, as what was intended for the point of my story appears, not improperly I venture to think, in the tail of it, it is without point of any sort. The fault is no doubt mine for not having my proof ready at an earlier date, but I must take the first and best opportunity of explaining that I am not guilty of quite such an invertebrate piece of fiction as has been presented to the public in my name. HENRY NORMAN.

LONDON, January 8.

Notes.

ROBERT BROWNING'S new volume, 'Parleyings with Certain People of Importance in their Day,' will be published in this country by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Ticknor & Co. publish next week 'Happy Dodd,' a tale of New England life, by Rose Terry Cooke; and 'Sons and Daughters,' by Henry Hayes, author of 'The Story of Margaret Kent.'

Cupples, Upham & Co. have in press a second edition of Dr. David Greene Haskins's 'Ralph Waldo Emerson: His Maternal Ancestors, with some Reminiscences of Him.' Curious silhouettes of the poet and his brother Charles are among the illustrations. There will be also a limited large-paper edition.

Ginn & Co. announce for next month 'Spanish Idioms, with their English Equivalents,' by Sarah Cary Becker and Señor Federico Mora. Some ten thousand phrases are included.

Henry Holt & Co. will have Miss Augusta Larned's 'Village Photographs' ready in the spring.

The common dictionary has long since outgrown its primitive scheme in encroaching on the domain of the encyclopædia. Hence one is not surprised that the J. B. Lippincott Co. have added to Worcester's Dictionary a new pronouncing biographical dictionary of nearly 12,000 "personages"—something more than "names," as we conjecture—and a new pronouncing gazetteer of the world, embracing more than 20,000 places.

The derivation and history of words will always be a favorite subject of intellectual sport as well as of serious investigation. As a part of education, such exercises deservedly rank very high; and Mr. Arthur Gilman's little book, 'Short Stories from the Dictionary' (Interstate Publishing Co.) will undoubtedly, as it deserves, find a warm welcome with American teachers. Its geniality and suggestiveness recommend it above other books of the class, for those who wish more than the dry bones of etymology. This study, however, if fascinating, is perilous at times; none is more full of pitfalls. For example (p. 46), Mr Gilman accepts the derivation of *saunter* from *sainte terre*, which, we believe, is now generally abandoned. Skeat says, "origin unknown."

We have already delivered judgment on the general scheme and usefulness of the series of "Actors and Actresses of Great Britain and the United States" (New York: Cassell & Co.), edited by Brander Matthews and Laurence Hutton, of which the last two volumes are now issued. In the first of them Macready and Forrest are written of by Lawrence Barrett, who is a sympathetic and effective author: and of the more noted of their contemporaries Charlotte Cushman is done by Clara Erskine Clement, Fechter by Kate Field, Sothern by Wm. J. Florence, and McCullough by William Winter. The last volume takes up the present time. The most important sketches are that of Booth, also done by Lawrence Barrett, that of Irving by J. Ranken Towse, a very just study, Bunner's tribute to Joe Jefferson, Winter's Wallack, Miss Gilder's Mme. Modjeska, and Mr. Laffan's excellent notice of Barrett. The articles are of extremely uneven merit, and as a whole are less good than the earlier volumes in criticism and style; but the completed work affords a comprehensive view of the personalities of the stage, and is convenient for reference.

Mr. Samuel Waddington, a sonnetteer himself, and the editor of at least two collections of sonnets, has now collected in a neat and pretty little volume 'The Sonnets of Europe' (London: Walter Scott; New York: Scribner & Welford). Mr. Waddington has gathered nearly 250 examples from Italian, Spanish, French, Ger-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man, Dutch, Scandinavian, Portuguese, Polish, and Greek poets, with one in Latin, erroneously ascribed. Many of these have been specially translated for this collection by Mr. Austin Dobson, Mr. Edmund Gosse, Mr. Cosmo Monkhouse, Mr. W. M. Rossetti, and the editor. Mr. Dobson's rendering of the frigid "Sonnet of the Mountain" of Mellin de Saint-Gelais is admirable in its precision, and excellent also are his translations from Du Bellay and of Molière's Sonnet to La Mothe-le-Vayer. Mr. Thomas Ashe supplies a version of the famous "Sonnet d'Arvers" which alone preserves that poet from oblivion, but he is scarcely as successful as was Longfellow, whose rendering is here also. Not a few other Americans appear here as translators, including Bryant, Col. Higginson, Mr. T. W. Parsons, Prof. Norton, Mr. Lowell, and Mr. Charles T. Brooks. Mr. Waddington's introduction is brief but to the point, and his notes full and exact.

Mr. William L. Hughes, who translated into French 'Les Aventures de Tom Sawyer,' has now followed it up with 'Les Aventures de Huck Finn, l'ami de Tom Sawyer' (Paris: Hennuyer; New York: F. W. Christern), with seventy-three illustrations by M. Achille Sirouy. It would be interesting to get Mr. Clemens's honest opinion of a French artist's pictures of Jim and the King and the Duke.

M. Jules Simon, in his official capacity of perpetual Secretary of the Académie des Sciences morales et politiques, continues his *notices historiques* of the eminent members of that body. Mignet, his predecessor, had omitted to speak of Michelet, fearing that he might not be impartial in regard to an historian whose methods and opinions were so different from his own. M. Jules Simon, perhaps because he is not an historian himself, has not felt the same reluctance. On the 4th of December, at the annual public session of the Academy, he read his address upon Michelet, which, while emphasizing the genius of this remarkable writer, is really a refutation of his views, a protest against many of his doctrines. We are here far from the *éloge académique* in which nothing but praise was dealt out, far from the panegyric pronounced in the French Academy when a new member is received. Michelet's 'History of France' and his 'History of the Revolution' are not spared. M. Jules Simon does not share the four hatreds of the author whose work he describes. Michelet loved many things as few men have loved, but he shows, especially in his 'History of the Revolution,' "la haine du prêtre, la haine du roi, la haine de l'Anglais, et la haine de la bourgeoisie." But, in spite of his protests, M. Jules Simon is kindled by the fire of Michelet; he too, usually calm, glows with indignation when he speaks of things past, with which, unconsciously perhaps, he connects what is now going on in France.

The fifth volume of the 'Mémoires de Saint-Simon' has been published in the 'Collection des Grands Écrivains de la France' (Paris: Hachette). The first volume was issued in 1879. M. Wallon, noticing the work in the *Journal des Savants* last year, said justly that he was beginning the examination of a publication of which he should certainly not see the end. He further expressed the hope that the scholar who had undertaken it would live long enough to terminate his work. M. Boislisle, though in the strength of age, will be a happy man if he can carry out this edition of the Mémoires as he has begun it. Thirty, even forty volumes may not suffice. On many pages the notes of the editor take up a great deal more space than the author's text, and there are, besides, numerous appendices and tables. So voluminous are the annotations that for the mere reading of Saint-Simon it may be preferable to use the 12mo edition just completed, based on the text of Chéruel, and prepared by M. Adolphe Regnier fils. The fifth volume of the "Grands Écrivains" edition is wholly filled by the year 1698, and contains 240 pages of appendices.

M. Charles Bigot, of the French delegation to the ceremonies attending the completion of the Bartholdi statue, is giving in the *Revue Bleue* his impressions of New York in a very entertaining manner. His accuracy seldom fails, though "New Jersey City" is one syllable too long, horse-cars *do* run on Madison Avenue, and it was Jim Fisk (not "M. Field") whom Stokes killed. M. Bigot cannot praise the loveliness of this city, nor its rectangularity, nor its numbered streets.

The Bulletin of the Société de Géographie contains a lively account, by M. H. Duveyrier, of the journey of the French Minister at Morocco from Tangier to Fez, and his interview with the Sultan at the latter place. There are also papers on the M'Bochis, a people inhabiting the right bank of the Congo above Stanley Pool, and describing a visit to the volcano of Jorullo in Mexico. The most valuable article is a "General View of New Caledonia," by M. Opigez. After a sketch of the country, its resources, political divisions and colonists, he gives a very full and interesting account of the manners and customs of the natives. These are divided into tribes speaking thirty-two dialects, so different that, though "two neighboring tribes can understand each other very well, two separated by a third are generally unintelligible to each other." They cultivate the land, hunt and fish, but have no other industry. Their religion consists in the recognition of two superior beings, the one good, the other bad. To the former they rarely pray, saying that as he is always good, it is needless. Their peculiar marriage and burial customs are also described at length. In common with all the Polynesian races, with the possible exception of the Fijians, they are rapidly disappearing. They number now about 22,000, three-quarters of whom are men.

The December Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society contains a very instructive paper by Mr. J. Y. Buchanan, "On the Similarities in the Physical Geography of the Great Oceans," the result principally of his observations made during the voyage of the *Challenger*. In describing his work in the Gulf of Guinea, "a hitherto unexplored region of the ocean," he made the statement, which may prove valuable for navigators, "that for a considerable distance along the Guinea coast the salinity of the surface water was an almost accurate test of the proximity of the land." The remarkable changes of temperature along parts of the continental shores (as, for instance, at Cape St. Lucas, where the temperature fell ten degrees in less than an hour), which have been generally attributed to the direct influence of currents from high latitudes, are shown to be due to the off-shore winds. These remove the surface water, which has to be supplied from the readiest source, the deep water on the coast—that is, not "by a long surface current, but by a short vertical one." The paper is illustrated by a map and diagrams showing the temperature and density of the oceans. Maj. de Lannoy de Bissy contributes an article on "Recent French Explorations in the Ogowe-Congo Region," by which a territory one-fourth larger than France, having a coast line nearly 800 miles long, with access to 5,200 miles of river navigation, and containing eight river basins, has been acquired by the republic "without shedding a drop of blood and at the trifling cost of £90,000." There are also the usual notes, reports of societies, and recent geographical publications.

A fine portrait of the late Marco Minghetti is given in the *Illustrazione Italiana* of Milan for December 26, 1886. The accompanying obituary notice is chiefly occupied with the political career of this high-minded statesman; but reference is made to that versatility which has so frequently characterized the great men of his race, as, to take a not remote though a more striking example, in the case of Massimo d'Azeglio.

Mr. Edward Roth, 1135 Pine Street, Philadelphia, is nearing the end of the biographical portion of his 'Complete Index to Littell's *Living Age*' (first 100 volumes). His tenth number ends with Vespucci.

The first issue of the *Proudhon Library* is before us (Boston, P. O. Box 3366). It begins the 'System of Economical Contradictions: or, The Philosophy of Misery,' translated by Mr. Benj. R. Tucker.

Prof. Palmer's second paper on the "Possible Limitations of the Elective System," in the January *Andover Review*, is no less suggestive than its predecessor. He maintains that the objections levelled against the system at Harvard are really intended for "its bastard brother, *laissez-faire*," and he shows how far from unrestricted, if only by "conflict of hours," the choice now is. As to soft or easy courses, he says they "will exist and ought to exist. Prescribed colleges, it is often forgotten, have more of them than elective colleges." As matter of fact and experience at Harvard, the forces which the elective system sets astir have such an influence, on teachers and pupils alike, "that questions of hard and easy studies do not, as outsiders are apt to suppose, seriously disturb the formation of sound intentions." Prof. Palmer looks forward to the extension, to the whole body of students, of the system of surveillance of individual progress through a committee, now applied to the special students. He has a capital answer to those who complain that the degree of A.B. loses its definiteness.

In the January *Auk*, Mr. Ira Sayles attempts to solve the question whether vultures have a keen sense of smell. From his own experience he concludes that all experiments should be made with reference to the wind, and on this ground he rejects Darwin's well-known trial with the condors at Valparaiso as proving "absolutely nothing." But he forgets that, whether the parcel of meat was carried to windward or leeward, Darwin declared that no dog under similar circumstances would have let the meat go undetected.

The *Forest and Stream* Publishing Co. announce a new periodical, the *Audubon Magazine*, to be printed in the interest of the Audubon Society for the Protection of Birds. It will be issued from the office of the Society, 40 Park Row New York, and will be largely devoted to natural history and subjects of interest to the young.

The *Science* Co. announce the immediate publication, in connection with that weekly, of a monthly magazine, called the *Red Cross*, in aid of the Agassiz Association work. This will supersede the well-known department in *St. Nicholas*. It will be edited by Mr. Harlan H. Ballard.

A trial bibliography of the writings of the late George P. Marsh is made in the December number of the *Library Journal*.

Among the various schemes of instruction by correspondence now in operation in this country, room certainly existed for one in the art of reasoning. This deficiency is now offered to be supplied by Mr. Charles S. Peirce of this city, whose address is No. 36 West Fifteenth Street. Mr. Peirce is well known in all scientific circles, and his special competence for this particular line of instruction is attested by the fact that he was formerly a lecturer on the Logic of Science at Harvard and at Johns Hopkins. He proposes to proceed "entirely by means of practical exercises to be performed by the pupil, each being accompanied by the necessary explanations of how it is to be executed, and followed by reflections upon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the nature of the proceeding and why it has been successful, with criticism of faults, and with answers to questions and resolutions of perplexities." Mr. Peirce has especially in mind "the wants of those young men and women who have been debarred from the privileges of a college education, and even from the training preparatory to it."

At Bonn, on the 15th of November, at high noon, under the auspices of the Neu-Philologischer Verein of the University, was unveiled the tablet marking the house in the Weberstrasse wherein died Friedrich Diez, author of the 'Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen' and 'Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen,' and quondam professor there. The inscription reads as follows: "In diesem Hause starb am 22 Mai 1876 Friedrich Diez, der Begründer der romanischen Philologie. Gewidmet vom Akad. Neuphilol. Verein zu Bonn." Appropriate remarks were made by Prof. Dr. Foerster, the successor of Diez. In the evening a meeting of the Verein was held, at which were present, among the guests from abroad, professors of the Romance philology from Göttingen, Marburg, and Madrid. The *Fest-rede* was delivered by Foerster, and speeches of a less formal character were delivered in French, Spanish, English, and German.

We take the following from a late issue of the *Novosti*: "Russian life is evidently beginning to have a very deep interest for Americans, thanks, especially, to the translations from the works of Gogol, Dostoyevsky, Count Tolstoi, and others of our writers, of which we have already had occasion to speak. The vast and really unexpected success of these translations has inspired some American writers to invent [the word also means 'to compose'] romances of Russian life for the benefit of the public. The New York bibliographical journals announce the appearance of several such romances. Among the rest, Marion Crawford, who is well known, and is one of the most popular American littérateurs, is preparing a long romance from Russian life under the title of 'Paul Patoff.' Crawford is not unknown to the Russian public. His romances 'Mr. Isaacs' and 'An American Politician' have been translated into Russian; the first under the title of 'In the Far East,' the second under the title of 'The Patriot.' Crawford has undertaken this novel of Russian life, not in the least deterred by the fact that he knows absolutely nothing of Russia or of the Russians, and that the whole sum of his knowledge of 'Russian customs' has been culled from the English translations of the productions of Russian authors. Moreover, as has been remarked recently by the French critic Bentzon, who has published an entire volume on American letters, Crawford, as a rule, does not trouble himself in the least to preserve historical illusion or vivid probability in his romances; in all his writings he gives free rein to his imagination, and describes only such tiny corners of the world as are connected with wonderful mysterious legends—India, for instance. It would be interesting to know what sort of a 'Russian legend' has served as canvas for this new romance of 'Paul Patoff.' The success of this story is assured, however, from a material point of view at all events, since the proprietors of the *Atlantic Monthly* paid Crawford a very large sum for the right of printing it, even before the MS. of the romance was completed."

— The march of Leslie Stephen's 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan) makes even the reviewer quicken his pace in order to keep up. Volumes viii. and ix. have just appeared, with a short interval between them, and break off with the sketch of Thomas Chaloner. Great is the array of the tribes of Burton, Butler, Cameron, Campbell, Carew, Carey, Carter, Cartwright, Cavendish, Cecil, and Chalmers in especial. The editor has reserved for his own most competent handling Bishop Butler, Byron, and Carlyle, and manifests once more his remarkable gift of compact narration, presenting a multitude of details alike without confusion and without dryness. As to the causes of Lady Byron's separation, he evidently holds that, rejecting the story told through Mrs. Stowe, some sufficiently weighty moral ground must be believed to have existed. Froude is tacitly censured for his execution of the literary trust confided to him by Carlyle. Byron's famous reference to his "grandad" is not forgotten in the sketch of the Admiral; but in the notice of Admiral John Byng one misses Voltaire's scarcasm, "pour encourager les autres." Under Camden the fact is mentioned that his house at Chislehurst became the refuge of Napoleon III. Isaac Butt is regarded as the probable inventor of the phrase "Home Rule." The publication of John Byrom's 'Universal English Shorthand' marked an era in the history of stenography. Henry Carey's authorship of the national anthem is held to be very doubtful. As usual, the catholicity of this dictionary produces strange juxtapositions. Elizabeth Canning, "impostor," and Margaret Catchpole, "adventuress," are admitted to good and regular standing beside the Queens Caroline and Catherine. The oddest name is perhaps that of Sir Julius Cæsar, and the oddest personage Alice (or Ellys) Carmylyon, a painter whose sex is left undetermined. It is pleasant to find (speaking of female artists) that Mrs. Julia Margaret Cameron, the Isle of Wight photographer, has not been overlooked.

— The American contact of these volumes is considerable, whether we instance Sebastian Cabot, or John Carver, or the Calverts of Baltimore, or Gen. Richard Butler of the United States Army, or Gen. Guy Carleton, or Patrick Calhoun, father of John C. Calhoun, or Alexander Campbell of the sect founded by his father, or Mathew Carey; that graceless wanderer Bamfyld Moore Carew, or the explorer Jonathan Carver. Of this last his biographer says, referring to his deed of land from the Sioux and Ojibways in 1767, he was spoken of by the Indians as "our good brother Jonathan," and makes the random guess—"whence possibly came the name of the Americans collectively." As Carver, like Trumbull, was a native of Connecticut, this does not disturb the Nutmeg State's claim to have bred the original "Brother Jonathan." "Frank Leslie" (Henry Carter) is credited with having been the first to cut up large wood blocks into small pieces for expeditious engraving. The late Randolph Caldecott, who died here, is commemorated in a space which seems disproportionate when compared to that allotted to America's great friend in her civil-war distress, the economist Cairnes. Finally, not a few friendships in this country are associated with Mary and Philip Carpenter.

—The fourth session of the Modern Language Association of America, held at the close of last month in Baltimore, was the most interesting and successful of its annual gatherings. About 150 members were present at the meetings in Hopkins Hall. James Russell Lowell was elected President for the ensuing year. The Association is emphatically a union of the younger philological scholars and teachers of literature. Some are members of the American Philological Association, but most, finding the time of meeting of that body inconvenient, or from lack of interest, had not previously been united in any common effort to promote linguistic study. The recent publication of a solid volume of transactions of 250 pages, embracing the papers read at the second meeting in 1884 (the preliminary gathering was only for organization), shows how important is the field of work which the society has assumed as its province. It contains original investigations in early English, French, German, and the different Romance dialects. A large and valuable portion is occupied with discussions of the order and method of study, and what constitutes a systematic course in the modern languages. It was necessary that the earlier meetings should devote special attention to this subject, owing to the imperfect recognition of these studies, and the fact that there was no agreement as to their relative order and position. In investigating the character and amount of attention devoted to the modern languages in the various colleges, and especially in the various papers presented upon the study of English, the Association has accomplished a valuable work. The improvement in instruction in the Southern colleges has been even more marked than in some other sections. Many of them offer thorough courses in the philology, as well as the literature, of the English language One important influence of the Society has been to stimulate the investigation of local dialects and put on record present forms which are in process of change, or are becoming extinct. The French dialects of Louisiana and of Canada have found competent investigators. The vast field of study presented by the languages of the American continent has been only in part entered upon. Having mapped out its field of work, the Association will naturally devote less attention hereafter to the purely pedagogic side, and more to literary and philological subjects. The Association publishes the *Modern Language Notes*, in which the most recent publications are reviewed. It also issues separate monographs which are designed to promote the study of the modern languages. These are often translations of noteworthy discussions which have appeared abroad, and whose further dissemination will promote the aims of the organization.

—President Gilman, at the opening meeting, welcomed the Association to Baltimore, and especially to the hospitality of the Johns Hopkins University. President Carter of Williams College delivered the annual address. The Secretary's report showed that the Association numbered 220 members, and that two members, Mr. William Cook of the Institute of Technology, and Prof. Louis Habel of the University of Norwich, had died during the year. The constitution of the Association was amended so as to provide for the election of three Vice-Presidents, who shall form, with the other officers, a special committee upon the papers to be read at each annual meeting. The next session will be held in Philadelphia. A committee was appointed to aid in securing from American scholars contributions in aid of the monument to the Grimm brothers at Hanau. Prof. Wood and Drs. Todd and Bright of Baltimore have charge of this matter. The social hospitalities of this meeting were no small part of its attractions. President Gilman gave a reception to the members on Monday evening, December 27, and Mr. D. L. Bartlett, a prominent citizen, on Wednesday evening. On Thursday the Association left for Washington, where it was accorded a reception by President Cleveland, and where the Corcoran Art Gallery and other collections were opened to it.

—The death of Mrs. Abby Kelley Foster last week recalled the enormous change in the public relations of the sexes in this country during the past half century, in no small measure because of this excellent woman's labors and sufferings. She was a young Quaker school-teacher in Lynn when she first heard Garrison speak against African colonization, and presently went and sold her trinkets and turned the proceeds into

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the anti-slavery treasury. Meantime the Grimké sisters of South Carolina came to New England to lecture on slavery, and against their will (though agreeably to their conscience) were drawn into addressing mixed audiences of men and women. This impropriety, which was thought nothing of on the stage or in the concert hall, drew down upon them the famous "Pastoral Letter" of the Massachusetts Congregational clergy, and other circumstances conspired to terminate their public career. "After the Grimkés left the lecture-field, only one woman entered it" —as she, Mrs. Foster, then Miss Kelley, has herself related—"and worked as well as she was able for seven years, before another woman came to her side. The service was terrible. The cross well-nigh crushed her. Besides the usual incentives to mob the abolitionists, came the requisition of the church and clergy to keep women in their proper sphere. Not only unsavory eggs, but the contents of stables and outhouses, were hurled against her meetings. Worse still, not a few ministers of high standing preached against her, their favorite text being Rev. ii, 20, 'I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman, Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce my servants to commit fornication.'" Worse still, we will add, the editor of a religious paper insinuated, in reference to Miss Kelley, that it was disreputable for a woman to be closeted with two men on a committee. Over her raged the memorable controversy in the abolition ranks concerning the right of women to participate equally with men in the direction and proceedings of the societies; and her appointment on a committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1840 was made the occasion of a sectarian secession. She continued to lecture long after she was married, and lived to see female lecturers a common and unobjectionable spectacle, and women associated with men on all sorts of committees, and made equal members of school committees and State boards of charities. She was one of the most pleasing and effective speakers of her sex, and Lowell has happily characterized her in the lines (dating from 1846)—

> "A Judith there, turned Quakeress,
> Sits Abby in her modest dress,
> Serving a table quietly,
> As if that mild and downcast eye
> Flashed never with its scorn intense
> More than Medea's eloquence. . . .
> No nobler gift of heart and brain,
> No life more white from spot or stain,
> Was e'er on Freedom's altar laid
> Than hers—the simple Quaker maid."

—That Henry B. Stanton died on the same day with Mrs. Foster (January 14) was no mere coincidence, for he had an active hand in the schism just referred to, though he cared nothing about the abstract question of woman's rights. His ambition was thoroughly political, and his aim, along with Holley, Birney, and other founders of the Liberty party, was to convert the anti-slavery organization into a political machine. He failed, and what he termed the "miserable" (and one of his associates the "confounded") woman question was one of the obstacles to his success, since female abolitionists at least could not be voters, and political action could not be exacted of them as a high moral duty. His detachment from the abolitionists was fatal to his distinction as a reformer, and won him no laurels worth remembering as a politician. He took what advantage he could of the clerical opposition to women as public speakers, so long as it aided his attack on the non-resistant (and therefore non-voting) wing of the abolitionists; but at the London World's Convention in 1840 he favored the admission of the female delegates from America, and his wife, as is well known, became one of the foremost leaders of the organized woman's-rights agitation a few years later.

The *National Review*, a foremost and able organ of the younger section of English Toryism, whatever may be thought of its political principles or of the vehement tone in which its writers advocate those principles, is eminently noticeable for the thoroughness and all-round excellence of its contributions in the department of pure literature. From among several articles, in its issue for the current month, well deserving the attention of the general reader, that on Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' by Mr. Reginald F. D. Palgrave, may be especially particularized. Carlyle, it will be remembered, in his quality of reproducer of Cromwell's speeches, claims for himself the character of "a pious editor." By the epithet "pious" we are, of course, to understand a profession of inflexible fidelity. Not a little startling, then, is the demonstration, just produced, that Carlyle, instead of using with scrupulous honesty the materials available for delineating the Protector, did not hesitate to manipulate them after the fashion of a person who, resolved on making good his theory in the teeth of fatally adverse evidence, shrinks from nothing in the shape of suppression or distortion of facts, or other discreditable devices and manœuvres. Beside these practices on his part, one must recognize as dwindling to a comparative trifle the license in which he allowed himself, unwarrantable as it was, of altering, by interpolations, omissions, and otherwise, the "authentic utterances of the man Oliver himself," in cases where their import is materially retained, to such an extent that he would not have had to go very much further if he had recomposed them *de novo*. All this is brought out, in detail, by Mr. Palgrave, and with a cogency of convincingness which it seems impossible to elude. Of multitudinous documents of first-rate value and authority, germane to his subject, it is also evinced that the "pious editor" had no knowledge as being existent, or else, where he had that knowledge, was too indolent or too remiss to make their acquaintance. It would appear now as if there were a studied disingenuous design in the language which he all but invariably employs regarding the manifold sources whence he derived his garbled representation of Cromwell and Cromwell's doings. "Foul Lethean quagmires," "waste rubbish-continents," "shoreless lakes of ditch-water," "hideous old Pamphletary Imbroglio," "dreary old records," "very watery," "the thing called Burton," "this two-legged Rhetorical Phantasm," and "pedants and dullards," are some of the contemptuous and repellant designations with which he bespatters them, as though of set purpose to deter others from the task—no very laborious one, considering his superficial research—of attempting to verify his statements and to test the validity of his conclusions. Pretty evidently those statements and conclusions are very far from being such as an exhaustive exploration and a dispassionate estimate of relevant historical data will ultimately be found to justify. The veritable Cromwell, as pictured at full length by some future Gardiner, will unquestionably differ in important features from the supposititious Carlylean hero.

—Prof. Willard Fiske's 'Biographical Notices, I. Books Printed in Iceland 1578-1844: A Supplement to the British Museum Catalogue' (Florence), already mentioned by us as in the press, has now come to hand. It makes a pamphlet of 29 pages, including the index. The library that has furnished this list of 139 titles is probably the most complete collection of its kind, either public or private, in existence. Its beginnings were made many years ago, but while as a whole it thus represents the gradual acquisitions of almost a lifetime, its greater part has been accumulated since the visit of Prof. Fiske to Iceland in 1879. How rich it really is is proved by the present list, which, as its title indicates, is a supplement to the British Museum Catalogue of books printed in Iceland. It aims, however, to supplement but a small part of that list, which is continued down to 1880, while this ends with the year 1844; the compiler, as he states in his "preliminary note," having taken the latter date as a convenient stopping-point because of the removal in that year of the then only existing press in Iceland from the island Videy, in the harbor of Reykjavik, over to the capital itself, which event was soon followed by increased activity, by the establishment of other presses, and by marked changes in typographical methods. That some such changes were necessary appears from the fact—which, however, Prof. Fiske does not cite—that the last title of his list, and probably last issue of the Videy press, is so full of typographical errors that it has furnished a popular proverb, current in Iceland to this day: As full of errors as the Videy Njals Saga. Descriptions of books printed after 1844 and most of the books themselves may be procured without difficulty. Prof. Fiske's list is not a mere catalogue. Every title is followed by full bibliographical notes, well and carefully compiled. Title-pages and the accompanying vignettes are described in detail. From about the middle of the eighteenth century the title-page frequently bears the price at which the book was sold. For the first half century this value is usually in stock-fish; prices ranging all the way from one fish for an arithmetic, compiled from a work by the Englishman, Edward Hatton, to thirty for a church *graduale*. In some cases the history of the particular copy described is given in full. The first book of the list, the code of laws known as the Jonsbok, printed at Hólar in 1578, for instance, belonged originally to King Frederick II. of Denmark—his arms and those of his queen appearing on the covers. On the death of that monarch it passed into the possession of Johan Bocholt, royal governor of Iceland. Afterwards it was owned by the German historian, Christopher Besold; and the year after his death it belonged to the Benedictine Abbey of Weingarten. Ultimately it became a part of the private library of the present King of Wirtemberg, whence it was sold. Based as they are upon an unparalleled knowledge of Icelandic bibliography, the notes are overflowing with important material, which not only sets at rest many vexed questions of authorship, but completes information until now only fragmentary. The author further announces in course of preparation: (a) Francis Petrarch's treatise *De Remediis utriusque Fortunæ*—text and versions; (b) Studies in Icelandic Book-lore; (c) a Bibliographical Record of Lorenzo da Ponte of Ceneda; (d) Works by Francis Petrarch printed in the fifteenth century—texts and translations.

—Dr. Wilhelm Junker, who has just returned to Europe, after a seven years' absence in Central Africa, was born in Moscow in 1840. Educated as a physician, the greater part of his life since 1874 has been spent in Africa. In the latter year he visited Tunis, and the following found him exploring Lower Egypt and the Libyan desert. His first important journey began in 1876, when he crossed the desert from Suakim to Kassala, and proceeded thence by Khartum and the White Nile to the Nyam-Nyam country visited by Dr. Schweinfurth six years before. Here he devoted himself particularly to investigating the sources of the Welle, with a view to solving the problem as to the course of that river, and also in order to determine the watershed between the Nile and the Congo systems. From this journey he returned in 1878, bringing with him valuable collections which were deposited in the Mu

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seum at Berlin. The next year, now accompanied by a white servant, he started for the same region, which was reached in the summer of 1880. He was received in a very friendly manner by the most powerful of the native kings, at whose town he made his headquarters. For two years he was busily employed in making extended excursions, to the west especially, tracing the courses of various rivers, mapping the country, making ethnographical collections, as well as in aiding the Egyptian commanders, Gessi and Lupton Bey, to rid their provinces of the slave-traders. In 1882, his companion having become seriously ill, he himself was seized with a longing for rest and home. First, however, he provided for the safety of his man, sending him to the northward with his collections. With great difficulty Bohndorff, abandoning the collections, forced his way through the districts already in revolt, to Khartum, where he saw Gen. Gordon and got his promise to aid the traveller if it was in his power. But the attack of the Mahdi's troops on the southern provinces of the Sudan, in which Lupton Bey was taken prisoner, followed soon after, and Dr. Junker was obliged to take refuge with Emin Bey at Lado, the principal station of the Equatorial Province. With him he remained till the beginning of last year, always hoping to be rescued by the English troops from the north. When this hope was finally abandoned, he started southward and reached the town of Kabrega, the King of the Unyoro, and asked permission to pass through Uganda. The King of this country, the son of the well-known Mtesa, who is almost crazy with fear of the whites, and had just refused to allow the relief expedition under the late Dr. Fischer sent by Dr. Junker's brother to go through his land, answered his request by sending an army which killed Kabrega and destroyed his town. The traveller, however, fortunately escaped, and made his way with great difficulty to an English mission station, at the south of Lake Victoria Nyanza, and thence to Zanzibar, which he reached December 4, 1886. Dr. Junker possesses in a high degree one quality essential to success in an African traveller—the ability to inspire the natives with respect and confidence. Their belief in his possessing supernatural powers saved his life on one occasion in 1881 when taken prisoner by a hostile chief. The reports of his journeys, which are undertaken at his own expense, are mostly brief, and deal largely with geographical questions. In this they differ from those of Emin Bey, which are very readable accounts of the people, their customs, traditions, and surroundings, together with graphic descriptions of scenery and the various details of a traveller's life.

McCLELLAN'S OWN STORY.—I.

McClellan's Own Story. The War for the Union, the Soldiers who fought it, the Civilians who directed it, and his relations to it and to them. By George B. McClellan, late Major-General commanding the armies. 8vo, pp. 678. New York: Charles L. Webster & Co. 1887.

In 1863 Gen. McClellan prepared a volume which was entitled 'A Report of the Organization and Campaigns of the Army of the Potomac.' This was filed in the War Department office, and in the next year an edition of it, with the addition of a sketch of his campaign in West Virginia in June and July, 1861, was published by Sheldon & Co., and used more or less as a campaign document in the Presidential election when McClellan was a candidate. The book was regarded by the Secretary of War as an extra-official paper, since it not only traversed the ground of his whole military career, the several campaigns of which had been separately reported in his current communications with the War Office, but collated and published much correspondence which did not call for new report, since it was already upon the files of the Department. It was received, however, and, after some months of delay, of which the General's friends complained, it was given to the public. It was his history of his military career, prepared as the justification of his conduct and generalship, and as his criticism of the Administration which had relieved him from command.

The present volume is in substance a revised edition of that Report, with considerable additions, a few omissions, and with some chapters of extracts from his private correspondence, chiefly with his wife. The changes are most noticeable in the earlier part of the narrative, where the discussion of relations to the Administration of Mr. Lincoln and of the organization of the Army of the Potomac naturally led him into matters which had not found place in the original edition of the Report. The chapters concerning his personal intercourse with Lincoln, Stanton, Scott, Halleck, and others, are, of course, new. Still, it will be found that the larger part of the Report, both substance and form, are embodied in the present book. Gen. McClellan's method, as indicated by his editor, seems to have been to annotate the original Report, referring to corroborating documents and correspondence. It can easily be seen that such a treatment of the material would not be so likely to lead to a full discussion of open questions as if there had been a complete rewriting of the work; though we must also remember that the earlier part of the book, which is most changed, is also that in which such discussion would naturally occur, and that the lack of it will be a sore disappointment to its readers.

In the original Report, addressed as it was to the Government, it was necessary to waive personalities, and to hold the tone of respectful narrative of fact. The change in the present edition which is most noticeable is the attribution to the Administration of Mr. Lincoln, and to the leaders of the Union party (as it was then called), of a conscious purpose to sacrifice the Army of the Potomac in order to diminish the personal and political importance of the general in command. This he speaks of as a "treasonable conspiracy," and says that it was to be carried out, "first, by endeavoring to force me into premature movements, knowing that a failure would probably end my military career; afterwards, by withholding the means necessary to achieve success" (p. 150). Although McClellan thus formulated the charge in the last years of his life, his private correspondence shows that he adopted it after the President and Congress began to be impatient at his inaction in the autumn of 1861, and that he never abandoned it.

Three questions are thus definitely raised by himself as the central ones in his public life: Did the Administration and the party in power endeavor to force him into premature movements? Did they afterwards withhold the means necessary to achieve success? And did they do this knowingly and wickedly, being "treasonably" willing to involve the country in ruin if they might thereby ruin him?

If this issue had not been thus tendered in the additions to the book written since 1881, it would seem incredible that any intelligent person could, at this distance from the war and its passions, hold any such opinion. Yet we are told that McClellan retained his full mental powers to the last, and pursued his study of military science with undiminished devotion, carefully noting all that occurred in the armies of the world, and keeping thoroughly informed of the progress of military discussion at home and abroad. The puzzle of it is, that by any possibility he could fail to see that such charges must react with destructive effect upon his military reputation, unless they are shown to be true in the light of our present knowledge of those events. As a military man he must have known that not a single writer upon our military history, of any repute whatever, thinks or believes that the supposed state of the case assumed by him when he penned his report of 1863, was the true one. The facts, as he believed them then, and as we know them now, differ in such essential particulars that arguments which were plausible then are now worthless. It is worse than blindness to repeat the old accusations and the old justifications, without acknowledging or showing any sign of recognition of the truth that his assumed facts are essentially wrong.

The central question in the controversy is one of figures. It was stated by the Comte de Paris in the volume of his history published in 1874. The French Prince had been a member of McClellan's staff, and never swerved from sincere personal friendship for him. Yet he declares that McClellan attributed to Johnston in the middle of October, 1861, "an effective force of 150,000 men, whereas, in reality, at the close of the month, it counted but 66,243 men in all, of whom but 44,131 were in active service (*sous les drapeaux*)." Making similar deductions from the national army, the same author gives McClellan's force as 133,301 on the 15th of October. The official reports show that on the 27th the number "present for duty" was 147,695. The French historian, as an eye-witness, further declares that up to this period, when the Confederates established batteries at the mouth of the Occoquan and at Matthias' Point, and thus interrupted navigation of the Potomac, no fault had been laid at McClellan's door, and he is himself forced to declare that at this time the General "lost the best opportunity he ever had to open a successful and decisive campaign" ('Histoire,' tome 2, pp. 163, 179).

The issue thus stated a dozen years before McClellan's death, by a writer of so friendly feeling and of so high a character, could not safely be passed unnoticed. Here was neither political nor personal enmity. The most distinguished member of his military family, one whose station and nativity were guarantees for the impartial kindliness of his judgment, had spoken. It would be impossible to summon him more authoritatively to account for his inaction in that unhappy autumn. If McClellan had in fact nearly a hundred and fifty thousand men against less than fifty thousand of his opponents, with what right can he say that urgency to take advantage of such an opportunity to open the campaign was an effort aimed at his ruin by forcing him into premature movements? Yet he has put the odious charge against the leading men of the nation in more offensive form than he had ever before publicly stated it, without making even the semblance of an effort to show that the inferiority of the enemy's force had been erroneously declared! The only estimates of Johnston's army are those contained in his original Report, and he does not even betray knowledge of the fact that they have since been universally rejected.

If fifty thousand men were holding a hundred and fifty thousand in a state of siege, were actually taking the aggressive and sparing troops to inflict a bloody repulse upon a detachment crossing the Potomac at Ball's Bluff on the upper river, and others to establish batteries and stop navigation on the lower river; if at this time the Baltimore and Ohio Railway was in the enemy's hands at Martinsburg and Harper's Ferry, and Maryland was seething with secession plots to revolt against the national Government and stop even the single remaining line of railway connection with the North, was it "premature" to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

use some urgency that the hundred and fifty thousand should move, or should at least strike out with vigor enough right and left to open the railway communication of the capital with the West and the water communication with the East? If, in addition to this, the Secretary of the Treasury was pressing upon the General the fact that the enormous expenditures of the war threatened quick bankruptcy, and every day added to the almost insoluble difficulties of the national finance, was this also to be regarded as the mere machination of personal hostility? If, still further, the besieged army grew from week to week till the hundred and fifty thousand in October became a hundred and eighty-five thousand in February, while the enemy in front remained substantially the same, while their batteries still closed the Potomac and the Western railway was still in their hands, was it "treasonable" that respectful questioning should grow into discontent, and that Congress should appoint a committee to inquire into the "conduct of the war"? Lastly, is it conceivable that, twenty years afterwards, the General of that great army should write his 'Own Story,' the criticisms of his friend the French Prince having been ten years in print, and yet not show even consciousness that such questions had been asked, though he aggravates the form in which he charges every one with dishonorable and unpatriotic motives who condemned his delays? Could he be ignorant that officers of that army, like Gen. Webb, who had tossed their caps for him with as great enthusiasm as ever greeted him when he rode through the camps, had been forced, when sitting down to write history, to declare the truth to be that the hypotheses in our long list of questions were facts, and that the "ifs" might be discarded?

If Gen. McClellan had been deceived by the elaborate and costly "secret service" of spies and other means of information which was part of his army organization, he, of all men, should have probed that matter to the bottom. It was worth time and labor to show whether he was misled by ignorance or treachery. As a mere question of army administration and belonging to the problems of which he was fond, it was an inquiry of first-rate importance to discover how an intelligent professional soldier in command of a great army could, through his whole military career, be so egregiously wrong in his knowledge of his enemy, and for a full year of that time believe the opposing force to be three or four times as great as it actually was. If special means of information are so much worse than useless, he was the very man to improve military science by showing why this is so, while at the same time he vindicated his own character by exposing the plausible deceptions by which he was misled. But of this, as of the other questions we have stated, his book makes no sign that he was aware.

The second part of his accusation against the Administration of Mr. Lincoln turns upon the same fatal question of relative numbers as the first. It is, that after he was engaged in his campaigns, they withheld the means necessary to achieve success. His editor insists that McClellan sent to Stanton his famous despatch from the James River after the "seven days' battles" with the closing sentences, which do not appear in the copy then given to the public by the War Department: "If I save this army now, I tell you plainly that I owe no thanks to you or to any other persons in Washington. You have done your best to sacrifice this army." If, however, his army was decidedly superior in numbers, in equipment, and in supplies of every kind, to that of the Confederates at every moment from the day he landed at Fortress Monroe till he returned to Washington, his charge reflects most damagingly upon himself. If, in front of Richmond, Lee divided his inferior army, sending Jackson to assault McClellan's flank at Gaines's Mill, and the latter, with superior forces in a central position, took no advantage of the situation, but began his retreat as soon as his single exposed corps was worsted, this surely was neither Lincoln's nor Stanton's sacrifice of the army. If, again, after Malvern Hill, Lee sent away Jackson against Pope with twenty-five thousand men, and himself remained with less than fifty thousand facing McClellan, whom reinforcements had made over a hundred thousand strong, it would seem that McClellan was not left wholly without the means necessary to achieve success. If, finally, when Halleck went to him in person, he declared that he could not safely resume the offensive without a still further addition of thirty thousand to his army, and estimated the enemy at two hundred thousand (as is shown by Halleck's uncontradicted letter in McClellan's original Report, though omitted in his 'Own Story'), it cannot be denied that it would be dangerous to rely upon his defending Washington on the line of the James.

McClellan knew that those who had investigated the subject since the close of the war were nearly unanimous in taking the views of the facts thus indicated. Yet in regard to the Peninsular campaign, as in reference to the preceding delay in the lines at Washington, he wholly ignores the vital question of the Confederate strength, except as he republishes with little change the strange estimates he made when the campaign was in progress. By what mental process he could conclude that a more injurious form of charging criminal intentions upon the Government would supply the place of intelligent discussion of these central facts, we try in vain to discover.

The personal controversies in which McClellan was involved are shown to turn upon this same central fact of his overestimate of his adversary. Here the chapters of extracts from his private correspondence throw strong light upon his character and upon the events. He was assigned to command the Division of the Potomac on July 27, and just ten days thereafter he writes of a "row with Gen. Scott," his commanding officer, growing out of a "pronunciamento" of his own "against Gen. Scott's policy." He adds: "If Beauregard does not attack to-night, I shall regard it as a dispensation of Providence. . . . I am leaving nothing undone to increase our force, but the old General always comes in the way. He understands nothing, appreciates nothing." The publication of the archives of the war makes this incident easily understood. McClellan had had several interviews with Scott, and had already urged upon the veteran his fixed idea of the enormous magnitude of the Confederate army and of the imminent danger of its attacking Washington. Scott did not accept the exaggerated estimate nor believe the enemy would attack. But McClellan was so possessed with the conviction of the peril that, to shift responsibility in case of disaster, he formally addressed the Lieutenant-General in writing, putting his warning "on record." This was his "pronunciamento." Scott immediately felt it to be one of the common devices by which an ambitious subordinate seeks to entrench himself at the expense of his superior, and sent it to the Secretary of War with some caustic comments. He said that he had been glad to confer personally with McClellan in regard to every phase of the situation and to give full weight to his opinions, but that since he insisted upon making a "record" in the matter, for the manifest purpose of putting his superior in the wrong, he distinctly stated his own belief that McClellan exaggerated the enemy's force, and that the Confederates were not likely to attack Washington. He sarcastically welcomed McClellan to the history he was making. The Secretary of War tried to persuade both parties to withdraw their letters, but Scott refused, expressing his own willingness to be retired at once.

If, then, the question of numbers be decided against McClellan, where does he stand in this quarrel with his commander? Beauregard and Johnston have published their memoirs, and show that they knew the superiority of McClellan's force and had no thought of attacking Washington. In this controversy, then, we are driven to conclude that Scott was right and McClellan was wrong. Yet the latter adhered to his illusion, and grew contemptuous in his treatment of the old General, whose judgment was the better one. On the 9th of August he reiterates that "Gen. Scott is the great obstacle. He will not comprehend the danger." On the 15th he writes: "I am almost tired out, . . . sleep with one eye open at night, looking out sharply for Beauregard, who, I think, has some notion of making a dash in this direction. Gen. Scott is the most dangerous antagonist I have." On the 16th he says: "I am here in a terrible place. The enemy have from three to four times my force; the President, the old General, cannot or will not see the true state of affairs. . . . I have no ambition in the present affairs; only wish to save my country, and find the incapables around me will not permit it." On the 20th: "If Beauregard does not attack this week, he is foolish. . . . I am gaining rapidly in every way. I can now defend Washington with almost perfect certainty." September 27: "The President sent a carriage for me to meet him and the Cabinet at Gen. Scott's office. Before we got through, the General 'raised a row with me.'"

On the 8th of September McClellan had submitted a paper to Secretary Cameron, in which, after stating that his own effective force was then "nearly 85,000 men," and that "by calling in the commands of Gens. Banks and Stone it will probably be sufficient to defend the city," he gives the opinion that the enemy will take the initiative and cross the Potomac near Point-of-Rocks and move on Baltimore. "I see no reason to doubt the possibility of his attempting this with a column of at least 100,000 effective troops. If he has only 130,000 under arms, he can make all the diversions I have mentioned with his raw and badly organized troops, leaving 100,000 effective men for his real movement. As I am now situated I can by no possibility bring to bear against this column more than 70,000, and probably not over 60,000,-effective troops." His proposal was "that all the available troops in Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and at least 10.000 Illinois troops, . . . and all those of the Eastern and Northern States be at once directed to report to me for duty." Besides asking for other enlarged powers, and that the Army of the Potomac be made "not less than 300,000 men," he closes with demanding "that no one, whatever his rank may be, shall give any orders respecting my command without my being first consulted." This last demand, of course, meant the deposition of Gen. Scott from the command in chief. If, now, the enemy's force was in fact less than 40,000, and, after waiting three weeks for the initiative the enemy would not take, the President, Cabinet, and Gen. Scott began to insist upon something being done on our side, and McClellan would not hear of anything but the defensive; is it strange Scott should 'raise a row with me'? And yet McClellan writes his 'Own Story' without referring to the question of the actual force of the Confederate army at that time, according to present evidence.

On October 16 (the time mentioned by the Comte de Paris in the quotations we have given)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McClellan writes: "Washington may now be looked upon as quite safe. They cannot attack it in front. My flanks are also safe, or soon will be. Then I shall take my own time to make an army that will be sure of success. Gen. Scott did try to send some of my troops to Kentucky, but he did not succeed." On the 20th or 21st he says: "The weather is delightful. The enemy has fallen back to Centreville and Manassas, expecting us to attack there." On the 26th, Scott's defeat, at least, approaches apace. "For the last three hours I have been at Montgomery Blair's, talking with Senators Wade, Trumbull, and Chandler about war matters. They will make a desperate effort to-morrow to have Gen. Scott retired at once: until that is accomplished I can effect but little good. He is ever in my way, and I am sure does not desire effective action. I want to get through with the war as rapidly as possible. . . . I go out soon after breakfast to review Porter's division about five miles from here." The last quotation, asterisks and all, is as it stands in the text. It is noticeable, too, that the redoubtable radicals of the Senate are not at this time trying to destroy him, but are making "desperate effort" to give him unlimited power. It succeeds, and on November 3 he is able to write: "At last I am the 'Major-General commanding the army.'"

Before the close of the month, however, he is "concealed at Stanton's to dodge all enemies in shape of 'browsing' Presidents, etc." He is "pretty thoroughly tired out," preparing a paper "to place on record that I have left nothing undone to make this army what it ought to be, and that the necessity for delay has not been my fault. I have a set of men to deal with unscrupulous and false: if possible, they will throw whatever blame there is on my shoulders, and I do not intend to be sacrificed by such people. . . . I cannot move without more means, and I do not possess the power to control those means. The people think me all-powerful. Never was there a greater mistake. I am thwarted and deceived by these incapables at every turn." On November 30, his official report showed his force "present for duty" 162,727, with 248 pieces of field artillery and 133 heavy. If, when he wrote his 'Own Story,' he had any evidence to show that the enemy at this time exceeded 50,000, it has not been given to the world. The analogy of the situation when he was preparing the "paper" mentioned, with that when he was similarly "making up a record" against Gen. Scott three months earlier, will strike the most casual reader.

ENGLAND'S CASE AGAINST HOME RULE.

England's Case against Home Rule. By A. V. Dicey, B.C.L., author of 'The Law of the Constitution.' London: John Murray. 1886.

Mr. Dicey's book is better than its title. It is not solely a statement of the arguments against the grant of what is called home rule to Ireland, but a careful, thoughtful review of the Irish question from the point of a constitutional lawyer; not a mere piece of one-sided advocacy, but a temperate examination, as well of the grounds for Ireland's demand, as of the reasons why the demand should be refused by England. Yet the absence of passion is due to no lack of vivacity. The book is bright, animated, vigorous, from beginning to end. It is more like a speech than a book—a speech which, though it would occupy some three or four hours in delivery, might be listened to without weariness throughout, so well do the point and briskness of the style sustain the attention of the auditor.

The plan of the treatise involves a good deal of repetition, but the author has rightly thought that repetition is no evil in handling a subject so intricate and so much confused by the representations and misrepresentations of political advocates. Shortly stated, the order of topics is as follows: First, the meaning of the term home rule, as going beyond mere local self-government, is determined. Then the causes which have given strength to the home-rule movement in England are investigated, and the current arguments for it criticised. Two alternative solutions of the present difficulty are stated—the maintenance of the existing union, and complete separation of the two islands; and each of these is passed in review. Then the home-rule solution is subjected to a minute analysis. It is considered under four forms—as Federalism, as Colonial Independence, as the revival of the system which existed from 1782 to 1800, called for shortness Grattan's Constitution, and as the scheme of Mr. Gladstone's Government of Ireland Bill of 1886, called for shortness the Gladstonian Constitution. A few concluding remarks sum up the result to which the examination of all these forms is deemed to have conducted the reader, viz., that home rule in any one of the forms proposed for it is inadmissible, as threatening England with greater evils than those which Ireland now inflicts upon her, as necessarily leading to separation, and as being, because it so necessarily leads, in reality worse than immediate and total separation.

There is much in every chapter—we had almost said in every page—with which a fair-minded reader, whatever be his prepossessions on the Irish question, will agree. The facts are always honestly stated, the arguments are always well considered and logically sound. They are, however, the arguments rather of a logician and a jurist than of a politician. The reasoning tends to become abstract, or, as a physicist would say, to move *in vacuo*, rather than to present and handle the problem in its practical and concrete shape. Mr. Dicey does not ignore facts—no one admits more honestly those that are against him. But he does not see them in their perspective. They seem to lie all equally near his eye. Small legal difficulties affright him which his opponents would confess to be difficulties, but would not recoil from, because they could be evaded or neglected. He does not deny the force which sentimental considerations exert, but as he personally dislikes them, he does not feel how immensely powerful they are. He admits, for instance, that the temper of the English democracy is an obstacle to the application of a firmly repressive government by England in Ireland. He argues, most justly and wisely, that such application of repression ought to be accompanied by a policy of broad, sweeping, and generous reforms in Ireland, getting rid of landlordism, and entirely reconstructing the present indefensible administrative system.

But his antagonists would reply—and, so far as we can judge, with truth—that in neither case does he make due allowance for the strength of the sentiment opposed to the course he recommends. The dislike to what is called "coercion" among the English masses may not be strong enough to prevent an English Ministry from passing acts which restrict in Ireland the ordinary liberties of the citizen. But the experience of the last few years seems to show that it is so strong as to prevent those acts from being stringent enough and being maintained long enough in force to effect their purpose. Whipping may be good for a child or indulgence may be good for a child. But a whipping which irritates without subduing the culprit, or a whipping after which the parent apologizes and burns the rod, is worse than either severity or indulgence, for it continues the mischiefs of both.

On the other hand, the view Mr. Dicey proclaims, that repression can only be justified and the Union preserved by carrying out large measures of ameliorative social and administrative reform in Ireland, will be heartily accepted by every observer who stands outside the English conflict. "To maintain the Treaty of Union with any good effect, we must sedulously do justice to every fair demand from Ireland, must strenuously and without either fear or favor assert the equal rights of landlords and tenants, of Catholics and Protestants, and must at the same time put down every outrage and reform every abuse" (p. 280). But the outside observer will ask whether there is any hope that an English Ministry and Parliament which is governing by repression, will pass such measures or work them out in a liberal spirit. Such a Ministry will be sailing on the other tack. It will draw its support from, it will be swayed by, those whose personal interests and feelings are opposed to large reforms. An enlightened despot could and would do exactly what Mr. Dicey suggests. But neither American nor English history suggests that democracies can be expected to act like enlightened despots. This is what we mean by saying that Mr. Dicey writes more as a jurist than as a politician. He admits the fact himself, as when he says (p. 277), "To a jurist it may appear conceivable, though hardly probable, that by the vigorous aid of the British Parliament the Gladstonian Constitution for the United Kingdom might have lasted two years." With all respect for jurists, and especially for a jurist of such eminent acuteness as the author of 'The Law of the Constitution,' the reconcilement of two nations, for reconciled they will have to be if the security of England and the smooth working of her Constitution are to be insured, is an undertaking requiring much more than a mastery of constitutional law, even with the addition of an upright and earnest heart. Nations have to put up with faulty constitutions, if those constitutions are the best which the circumstances admit of; a lesson which the history of Southern Reconstruction is perhaps better fitted to impress upon Europe than any circumstances within its own experience.

The same deficient perception of existing political forces appears in Mr. Dicey's treatment of what he calls "the argument from the inconvenience to the English Parliament of the presence of Irish members bent on obstruction." He seems to think that this argument is grounded merely on the unwillingness of English members to alter the procedure of their own assembly, and assumes that it can be got rid of by amending that procedure, possibly with the addition of a change in the relations of the Executive to the Legislature, so as to render the former more independent of the latter. Such a change might mean a total dislocation of the delicate machinery of English government. But, passing that question by, any practical politician can see that the presence in a deliberative assembly of a section, numbering one-seventh of the whole, which desires to lower the character of the assembly, to derange its mechanism—in fact, to stop its working altogether—and which has no interest in the business it conducts beyond that of proving that it is incompetent to conduct a large part of its business, is a mischief that goes far too deep to be cured by any changes in the rules of debate. He may well be justified in holding that such a mischief is not alone sufficient to require the dissolution of the Union; but his own speculative attitude has prevented him from appreciating its real nature, as a much inferior member of any legislative body might do.

Subject to these limitations of the author's view, and partly in consequence of them, the book is an admirable piece of destructive criticism. It is destructive in more directions than one, for it contains an arraignment of the con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duct of England to Ireland far more telling, from its calm incisiveness, than the heated harangues of Nationalist orators. The Unionist party in England have found in Mr. Dicey an ally who must surely have alarmed them by his admissions. Such admissions have a worth and use for both parties. Not only ought they to lead those who share his attitude of resistance to the Irish demand, to reconsider their position and the arguments by which they support it—to feel how absolute is the need for a "new departure" in the methods by which England has governed Ireland; but they can hardly fail to dispose his antagonists to give a fair hearing to the objections which he urges to the scheme of home rule propounded by the Gladstonian party last spring. He shows how many differences there are between that scheme and the instances cited on its behalf from other countries. He explains the relations between the British Government and the governments of the great English colonies, accentuating the points in which those relations must differ from any such as could be established between Great Britain and Ireland. He points out the inherent weaknesses of federalism, and insists on a point which, obvious as it seems to Americans, Englishmen evidently cannot have realized, that to establish a federal relation between Great Britain and Ireland means nothing less than to reconstruct the British Constitution from its foundation.

That a discussion at once so fair and so vigorous of a subject clouded by so many prejudices, passions, and misconceptions, will do good in England it is impossible to doubt. It is calculated to cool men's tempers while it clears their minds. Whether it will change opinions is another question. Those who already agree with Mr. Dicey's conclusion will find an arsenal of arguments made ready for their use which few could have forged for themselves. Those who differ from him will be apt to think that the force of his reasoning is more formal than substantial. They may be unable to break the chain of his logic, but they will feel that it has omitted to meet many of the considerations which govern their own judgment. They will say, also, that a destructive treatment of such a subject is only a half treatment. When an army is cooped up in a dangerous defile, a member of the council of war who demonstrates the risks of attempting a particular movement to the right exposes himself to the question, "What then do you advise? Some effort to escape must be made, for we cannot stay where we are." So the answer that one anticipates to this book is, "What do you propose? England and Ireland cannot go on as heretofore: that you practically admit. If home rule is so dangerous, propound your own alternative." Mr. Dicey, whose only alternative seems to be that England should utterly change her feelings towards Ireland and her manner of governing Ireland, would doubtless reply that his duty is discharged if he has shown that of all possible solutions home rule is the worst. This proposition, however, is a proposition so wide that to prove it is practically impossible, because all prediction in politics is from the nature of the matter uncertain. The controversy seems in England to have reached that phase in which the party who have got a definite plan, and a new plan, will win, not necessarily because their plan is right, but because it promises to avoid the old failures. To revert again to the experience of this country, the enfranchisement of the Southern negroes was open to a hundred objections—objections so weighty that a critic might well have deemed himself to have proved it the worst of all possible courses. Many of those objections were incontestable. Many of them have been verified by the result. Nevertheless, the negroes were enfranchised.

THE CRIMEAN JOURNEY OF CATHARINE II.

Lettres du prince de Ligne à la marquise de Coigny, pendant l'année 1787. Publiées avec une preface par M. de Lescure. Paris: Librairie des Bibliophiles. 1886. Pp. xxi, 69.

THIS charming little volume is one of a collection "des petits chefs-d'œuvre," and the nine letters it contains are certainly among the best of their kind. But "chefs-d'œuvre"? Well, perhaps the longest, an autobiographical sketch of twenty pages, may be so called. As for the rest, one does not ask what they are, since such as they are they are most entertaining. They are unique: letters written by a man of fifty, who had enjoyed more than almost any other man the advantages of intimacy with the most important historical personages of his time, to a woman of twenty-seven, so famous for her beauty, her wit, her charm, her pride, that Marie Antoinette said, with a smiling sigh, "I am only the queen of Versailles; it is Mme. de Coigny who is the queen of Paris." Moreover, the subject of these letters, or rather (for the subjects touched upon are most various) the framework of them, is the extraordinary Crimean journey of Catharine II. The Prince de Ligne was one of that remarkable company of travellers. It is from this point of view, we confess, that these letters seem to us of most permanent and general interest. Time has somewhat dimmed the grace of the Prince's compliments and dulled the point of his witticisms, but the brilliancy of his lively sentences reflecting the scenes about him is still possessed of magic power, and we see scarcely less vividly than he the wonderful things he saw.

Catharine, after annexing the Crimea to her own dominions, visited it under the guidance of Prince Potemkin and accompanied by the Emperor Joseph, and she carried in her suite on this six-months' journey the English and Austrian ambassadors, the Prince de Ligne (to whom she presented an estate in Taurida, as a reward, as it were, for his attendance), and the French ambassador (his intimate friend), the Comte de Ségur—the same Comte de Ségur who, five years before, as bearer of despatches to Rochambeau, had marched, if not fought, in our cause, following in the steps of his friend and connection Lafayette. He, too, gave a narrative—a much longer and more detailed, a serious and dull narrative—in his 'Mémoires,' of this magnificent "progress"; and the two friends supplement each other admirably.

In the pages of formal historians the incidents of the journey are usually summed up in sentences which take shape in the memory somewhat after the fashion of head-lines: Astonishing deceptions practised by Prince Potemkin on Catharine! He wishes to stimulate her to continued conquests! He deludes her with regard to the resources of the country! Populations migrate secretly along her path!! Temporary villages!! Fictitious highways!! Stage artifices on an incredibly stupendous scale!!! These rumors prevailed even at the time, and at the time the Prince de Ligne contradicts them. One surmises that even this shrewd and practised observer saw the things now before him a little too much *en beau* (and very naturally, looking at them from the Empress's carriage window); and it does more to justify the judicial blindness of Catharine herself than anything else could. The Prince says, in one of his last letters:

"I know it is not the fashion to believe . . . anything good of Russia. Even those among the Russians themselves who are vexed at not having been with us, will assert that we have been deceived and that we deceive. The ridiculous story has already been spread that pasteboard villages have been transported along our way for a circuit of a hundred leagues, that the vessels and the cannons were painted, the cavalry without horses, etc."

There may have been no pasteboard villages, but the high-born travellers give proof that men of pasteboard would have been the same to them as the villagers and peasants and serfs among whom they passed, and the Prince's pages describe only a superb "spectacle."

In January, 1787, they set off. The travelling procession was composed of 14 carriages and 184 sledges, with 40 others to be used if needed. Five hundred and sixty horses were ready at each post. When night fell, great bonfires each side of the road along the whole way made it brighter than day. Wherever they stopped to eat or sleep they "found encampments marvellous from their Asiatic magnificence in the midst of deserts"; while, on their return in the summer, "the carriages were full of peaches and oranges, and the valets drunk with champagne." February, March, and April were spent at Kieff awaiting the breaking up of ice on the river. Catharine established some of the conditions of court-life while there, and received homage from all the wild nations that surrounded her. There congregated to see her the famous Cossacks of the Don; a Prince of Georgia bringing tributes; Chinese deputies "who waggled their heads like the figures that are on the mantelpiece of your chimney"; envoys from the wandering Kirghiz; troops of "independent" Tartars, and savage Kalmucks and crowds of Poles.

On the 1st of May, the Empress, embarking in her barge, set sail on the Dnieper, followed by a stately fleet of more than eighty vessels with three thousand men. The splendid apartments constructed on the decks of the eight "court" ships glittered with gold and silk, and were furnished with elegant comfort, while twelve musicians on each barge increased the sense of luxury. Numberless boats and canoes and fast-sailing skiffs fluttered continually about the squadron, and into these the voyagers often entered, to gain opportunities of walking on the banks of the river, or through the fertile islands among which the river flows. A concourse of spectators constantly crowded the river sides, and the beautiful, sunny, verdant landscape beyond was so ornamented and disguised with triumphal arches and other architectural decorations as to produce completely illusive effects. The picture drawn of the whole scene by the trustworthy Ségur is very extraordinary.

After five days they reached Kaneff, where they were awaited by the King of Poland and his court. "Foolish Poniatowsky!" (so Carlyle depicts him) "an empty, windy creature, redolent of macassar and the finer sensibilities of the heart, . . . an elegant inane creature with vaporous sentimentalisms and sublime sorrows and disappointments." The Prince de Ligne saw only his charming side. "I went," he says, "in a little Zaporogian canoe to announce to him our arrival. An hour after, the great lords of the empire came to escort him in a brilliant sloop; and on entering it he said to them, with the inexpressible charm of his fine appearance and of his delightful tone of voice: 'Gentlemen, the King of Poland has commissioned me to commend to you the Count Poniatowsky.'" "Ornamental wholly; the body of him and the mind of him got up for representation," says Carlyle again. Stanislas and Catharine had not met since they had been lovers thirty years before. Six or seven years after that she had, as it were, given him his crown, which only a year later than this she was to take from him. The Comte de Ségur and the Prince de Ligne and others of the party, her more personal friends, anticipated with some excitement this dramatic meeting. As the King ascended the imperial barge, they pressed about him; "but," says the Count, "our ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pectations were almost entirely disappointed; for after a mutual salutation, grave, cold, and dignified, Catharine giving her hand to Stanislas, they entered alone an apartment where they remained tête à tête for half an hour." When they reappeared, the Count (he was *tant soit peu* a sentimentalist) asserts that "over the Empress hung a cloud of embarrassment and unusual restraint, and in the eyes of the King was a certain sadness." At the entertainment which followed, "little was eaten and little was said," the Count notes; but the Prince declares: "The dinner was very gay." On rising from table the King handed to the Empress her gloves and fan, and looked for his hat; the Empress seeing it sooner than he, handed it to him. "Deux fois couvrir ma tête," said the King, gallantly, alluding to his crown; "ah! Madame! c'est trop me combler de bienfaits et de reconnoissance" The poor Count finds this interview only too well fitted for history; "for it was certainly not embellished and animated by any excess of tender sentiments." But he might have been consoled by the Prince de Ligne's view, who says, "The King of Poland had been waiting for us at Kaneff, and expended three months and three millions to see the Empress for three hours."

The Emperor Joseph and Catharine were to have met at Kherson, but he, arriving there before her, hastened still forward. She learned this change of plan, and, desirous of showing equal cordiality, she suddenly disembarked, leaving almost all her suite behind her, and, getting into a carriage, came across the Emperor on the road near the solitary house of a Cossack. Here they remained for some hours, and partook of a repast prepared, in the absence of all attendants, by the hands of Prince Potemkin himself and his friends the Prince of Nassau and General Branicki, and which "was as detestable," Count Ségur declares, "as might have been expected from such noble cooks." The Emperor, while in Russia, travelled as the Count of Falkenstein, and was accompanied only by a general officer and two servants. It was "a singular journey," as the Emperor himself said, adding: "Who would have dreamt of seeing me with Catharine the Second and the Ministers of France and England, wandering in the desert of the Tartars! It is altogether a new page in history" It was sometimes like a page from the 'Arabian Nights'; and the novel sights, native to the country, which they saw with the unpractised eyes of statesmen and diplomats (very unlike the trained observation of the born traveller), combined with the gorgeous spectacles arranged by Prince Potemkin, had on them an almost bewildering effect. "I know no longer," cries the Prince, "where I am, nor what age of the world it is." He might well believe himself to be dreaming when, dropping asleep in the royal carriage from heat and fatigue, he "heard, on awaking, one of my travelling companions saying, 'I have thirty millions of subjects, as I am told, reckoning only the male population'; and the other answering, 'And I two and twenty millions, counting all.' 'I must have an army of at least six hundred thousand men from Kamtchatka to Riga,' adds the former, and the latter replies, 'Half that number is exactly what I need.'"

He continues:

"In our travelling carriage we review every State and every great personage, and heaven knows how we treat them! 'Rather than sign the secession of thirteen provinces, as my brother George has done, I would have shot myself,' says Catharine gently. 'And rather than resign, as my brothers and my brother-in-law have done by assembling the nation to talk of abuses, I know not what I would not have done,' says Joseph II. . . . They were also of one opinion respecting the King of Sweden, who is no favorite with either, and against whom the Emperor, as he said, conceived a dislike in Italy on account of a blue and silver dressing-gown, with a diamond star. Both agreed that he has energy, talents, and wit."

Their imperial majesties sometimes "felt each other's pulse about those poor devils the Turks. Hints were dropped and then they looked at each other." And it was not only the majesties who looked at each other. A few words from the Empress respecting the relations of France to the Mussulmans caused "Ségur to turn pale and Nassau to flush, while Fitz-Herbert gaped open-mouthed and Cobenzl was perturbed and I laughed," says the Prince. Catharine talked a great deal of her "petit ménage," her little establishment, as she designated her vast empire. But the conversation was not always of States and great personages. One day she desired to be taught to write verses. Like the famous Malebranche she could not learn the art. His greatest success was in these lines:

"Il fait le plus beau temps du monde
Pour aller à cheval, sur la terre et sur l'onde,"

Catharine got as far as

"Sur le sopha du Kan, sur des coussins bourrés,
Dans un Kiosque d'or, de grilles entourés."

They made great fun of her Majesty for being unable to get off her sofa after four hours of effort; and the scene was evidently one of very free and jesting familiarity. Indeed, the whole tone both of the Prince de Ligne and the Comte de Ségur about Catharine shows a complete bonhomie on her part, made possible by the immense admiration and respect as for a man with which she inspired these men, who called her—to her face and also behind her back—Catharine *le Grand*. One day she commanded them all to use the *tu* to her. Down came a mighty deluge of *tutoi-ing—à bras raccourcis*—the last always more comical than the preceding one. "I interlarded mine with the title *Majesty*, and I thought *ta majesté* did very well. Others knew not what to say, but her *thou-ing* and *thou-ed* Majesty looked none the less the autocratess of all the Russias, and almost of all the world."

In another conversation referred to here, but reported more fully by the Prince to his friend Grimm, Catharine asked them what they thought she would have become had she been born a man and a private person. The English Ambassador replied that she would have been a great legislator; the Austrian, a distinguished minister; the Prince de Ligne said she would have been a famous general. "No," she said to him, "*you* are mistaken; had I been a soldier I should have risked everything in the pursuit of glory, and I should have been killed before I was a captain." "I do not believe it, madam," answered the Prince, "for I am still alive." The Empress did not catch his meaning at once, but when she did she took in perfectly good part the rebuke it contained for assuming that she would have shown greater daring than he and many others

It is impossible in these limits to give any indication of the extraordinary condition of the country through which they passed, or of the political complications and anticipations of war that chiefly occupied the thoughts of the whole party; but here is a picture from which many conclusions may be drawn respecting Catharine's modes of government:

"For two months now I have been throwing money out of the window: I have done so before, but not in the same manner. This is the fashion of it: by my side in the carriage is a great green bag, like that in which you will put your prayer-books when you become pious. This bag is full of imperials, pieces of four ducats. The inhabitants of the neighboring villages, and even from ten, fifteen, twenty leagues' distance, come to meet us, to see the Empress. This is what they do: a long quarter of an hour before her coming they lie down on their faces, and do not rise for a quarter of an hour after we have passed; on these backs and these heads kissing the earth I pelt down gold at full gallop; and this takes place ten times a day."

So, with jestings and heart-beatings, tossing millions to the prostrate peasantry, and forgetting to take them into account among the problems to be solved, talking of peace and rushing towards war, with fireworks costing 40,000 rubles and illuminations representing Vesuvius, these representatives of civilization went and came through the lands of barbarism. Civilization—barbarism? Is there a deeper meaning than he gave to it in the Prince de Ligne's own saying—"Il n'y a de civil que les gens qui ne sont pas civilisés"?

RECENT RELIGIOUS AND ETHICAL LITERATURE.

History of Interpretation. By F. W. Farrar. Eight lectures preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1885, on the Bampton Foundation. E. P. Dutton & Co. Pp. 553.

The Philosophy of Religion, or the Basis of its History. By Prof. O. Pfleiderer. Translated from the second German edition by Alexander Stewart, M.A., and Allan Menzies, B.D. Vol. I. London: Williams & Norgate. Pp 740.

Die Nothwendigkeit der Religion: eine letzte Consequenz der Darwinische Lehre. Von Dr. F. Dahl. Heidelberg: Weise. 1886. Pp. 112.

Moderne Versuche eines Religionsersatzes. Von Dr. H. Druskowitz. Heidelberg: Weise. 1886. Pp. 90.

In Sachen der Spiritismus und einer Naturwissenschaftlichen Psychologie. Von A. Bastian. Berlin: Stricker. 1886. Pp. 216.

Jenseits von Gut und Böse: Vorspiel einer Philosophie der Zukunft. Von Fr Nietzsche. Leipzig: C. G. Naumann. 1886. Pp. 266.

Outlines of the History of Ethics for English Readers. By Henry Sidgwick. Macmillan & Co.

L'Évolution de la Morale. Par Ch. Letourneau. Paris: Delahaye. 1887. Pp. 978.

Ethik: eine Untersuchung der Thatsachen und Gesetze des sittlichen Lebens. Von Wm. Wundt. Stuttgart: F. Enke. 1886. Pp. 577.

Principles of Morals. (Introductory chapters.) By J. M. Wilson and T. Fowler. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1886. Pp. 133.

THE Bampton lectureship is a great honor even for an Archdeacon of Westminster. Although the lectures must be printed within two months after they are delivered, the appointment is made long beforehand, and the lecturer has both opportunity and incentive to do his best work. Canon Farrar describes, perhaps as well as his limits permit, the fashions in Biole exegesis from ancient Jewish down to modern times – legalistic, Alexandrian, allegorical, traditional, ecclesiastical, Aristotelian, and dogmatic—in historical succession, with hundreds of references and footnotes that suggest, not so much the special scholar as a diligent general reader. He has no patience with any theory of verbal inspiration, and intimates that he is doing his best to kill off bad theories of inspiration and revelation. The very fact that method after method of interpretation has been rejected by widening knowledge, and that the Bible has survived such absurd pedagogy for so many centuries, is in fact the best of all arguments for its supreme intrinsic merit. The Renaissance seems to have started well towards a sensible and truly historical conception of the real character and treatment of Scripture, but these hopeful tendencies were strangled by the scores and hundreds of systematic theologies which followed the Reformation. The author says, in substance, that it is more blasphemous to reject the lessons of history and science than human theories about Scripture, and that to invest our conclusions about the Bible with any of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its authority—the besetting sin of commentators—is an exegetical fraud. In his view the Bible itself is as unchanged as nature, but we should no more accept old views about it than we should accept the opinions of Pythagoras and Ptolemy about nature. He almost seems to agree with Bishop Herbert Marsh, who is quoted as saying squarely that the Bible must be examined by the same laws of criticism which are applied to other writings of antiquity. We hope the trustees of the John Bampton fund are less exacting in interpreting the words of his will than the critics of the Andover theology.

A really thorough and scholarly historian of the philosophy of religion, such as Prof. Pfleiderer is, finds his task by no means an easy one, for the question of utter scientific sincerity—not only his own, but that of those of whom he writes—enters as a complication, consciously or unconsciously, into every part of his work. The second volume of his history includes writers from Schleiermacher down to the present time, and is to be followed by two more volumes treating the philosophy of religion genetically and speculatively. Though these later volumes contain important additions to the first edition, on the development of the religious consciousness in its beginnings among the Indo-Germans, the Semitic race, and in Christianity, it is the first two volumes of this edition only that are here so enlarged as to constitute almost a new work. The digest of the views of Schleiermacher and especially of Kant, whose significance for religious thought is now so rapidly growing in appreciation, constitutes the best chapters in the book, because written, as is very evident in the case of Kant, with admiration and even ardor. The defect in the author's exposition throughout is his failure to reduce the abstract metaphysical phraseology, in which much of the philosophy of religion has been written, from the idealistic standpoint to the clear and concise language which all subject-matter in the metaphysical realm is now so happily seeking.

Dr. Dahl is a young zoölogist, and his thought is concise enough. He finds that, from the standpoint of natural history, religion is in the highest degree advantageous and even necessary for men. Its objective validity is a matter of no interest, and is, in fact, unknowable. We want no proofs or knowledge, but only faith. Christianity is the highest of all religions, and not merely fills gaps in scientific knowledge, but has always had, and will continue to have, the same domain. Miracles are possible, immortality sure, the Bible all true, etc.—all in a large, high, and sometimes almost esoteric sense. In fact, as Kant thought the undevout astronomer mad, Dr. Dahl is not very far from the conviction that the unchristian Darwin is defective in moral, if not in mental, insight. To know that the best survive and rise to ever higher stages of development is a new source of consolation, which tips the scale for those who die in the struggle for existence to the side of pleasure, in the insight that their death clears the way for the higher development of better organizations.

Dr. Druskowitz thinks Christianity is fast passing away—has already, in fact, lost its hold on most of the best men. Miracles, immortality, and theologies must go with it. Worst of all, neither Feuerbach, Dühring, Dubal, nor Comte has given us an adequate substitute. Social relations must be considerably changed before a worthy substitute could find a foothold, were it entirely manifest what and where it was to be found. Indeed, were these ideal social conditions realized, we should then see that man must rise above the realm of religion to higher insights. Man's duty is to strive to attain the highest development of all that is within him, but also to keep alive a sentiment of supreme loyalty to the sources of all existence.

A. Bastian's is certainly the most chaotic mind among the psychological anthropologists. He does not believe in indexes, chapters, or sections of any sort; quotes incessantly, often in half-a-dozen languages on a page, and from all sorts of known and unknown authors. Slade and the olfactorial Dr. Jäger furnish the author a text, and he shows overwhelmingly that such spiritualistic theories and performances have always been in the world and been cherished. He concludes with his well-known thesis, that the thoughts of the races of mankind must be gathered and tabulated, as the bases of a psychology that shall rest on the only solid foundation of natural science.

Nietzsche writes on the prejudices of philosophers, the essence of religion, the natural history of morals, and so forth, as introductory to his forthcoming philosophy. There is a levity, almost flippancy, in his style, which is hardly less clear and brilliant than that of Schopenhauer, his great master in a sense, and it does not impress one favorably with his seriousness. Christianity is Platonism for the people. It was rooted, perhaps, ultimately in primitive animism, but chiefly in the horror of the naïve, instinctive faith, that led Socrates to evolve the concept which Plato hypostatized as idea, etc., though the Church, in later accepting faith as an authority, partially atoned for this one-sidedness. The savant's love of wisdom is really love of his own wisdom, and philosophy is itself most introspective. Consciousness is a form of sacrificing intellect to the unconscious. This Platonic, Christian, philosophic idealatry, or fiction of a transcendental world, which broke out as an acute religious neurosis some two thousand years ago, has tamed and domesticated man till he is insipid and degenerate, like a too much handled cat. It has, however, happily developed a tension in the mental and moral world, and given promise that we shall see things as they really are; and the new psychology, which seeks the truth to do the right and is the future queen of all the sciences, will do the rest.

M. Letourneau holds that philosophy has been separated so long from science that its abstract ideas have become mere naïve and subtle attenuations of animism. Even moral ideas and habits, from the standpoint of the anthropologist, which the author represents, are products of comparatively recent growth, the stages of which, for the benefit of pedagogues and moralists, he endeavors to formulate (after preliminary sections on heredity and the instincts and moral character and conflicts of animals) as follows: (1.) *Bestial morality*, including anthropophagy, war, human sacrifices, infanticide, abortion, marriage, property. (2.) Savage morality. (3.) Barbaric morality, illustrated by the ancient Mexicans, Peruvians, Egyptians, Persians, and Chinese. (4.) Industrial or mercantile morality. Metaphysical morality—or, which is the same, the morality of attenuated religion—is disparaged, and the civilized man of to-day stands without any sense of restraint from the morality of the past. He can only be saved by a new, severely scientific, and utilitarian morality, signs of the coming of which are said to abound, but which can only be inaugurated by the formation of small groups of ethical innovators, who by their words and conduct shall incite to the formation of other groups, and thus gradually metamorphose the innately perverse nerve centres whence all ethical conduct springs.

Wundt's industry is amazing. He has already written on nearly all the special departments which are covered by philosophy, and is yet but little over fifty. There is a breadth about his treatment of logic, ethics, and psychology which one seeks in vain in any other contemporary writer. Sidgwick and Lotze were more widely read and more deeply ethical in nature than is Wundt; Venn and our own Charles Peirce are far better grounded in logic than he; and Horwicz and Steinthal, Lotze and Herbart, all surpass him, except in the purely experimental chapters of psychology. But his very freedom from the traditions of the university philosophy and from much useless lumber of scholastic learning has enabled him to turn the light of fresh, modern common sense, tempered by a more or less scientific training, on to every philosophic subject he touches, vastly to its advantage. He will eventually prove, if we mistake not, chiefly an inciter and suggester of more detailed work that will supersede his own at most points by going further along the same lines. In the present imposing volume the topics are chosen and grouped in the index in an almost inspiring way. Every reader will feel that this is the basis and this the method for something like adequate treatment of ethical problems. When we turn to the special sections, however, our expectations are only imperfectly realized—not so much, after all, from any deficiency of learning or of thought, as from the vastness of the field covered, which requires general treatment, and makes methods of sufficient detail impossible for a single volume or more. Ethics has long struggled with the problem how to unite the highest well being of the individual with that of others—a problem to which much ethical literature is now devoted. However this may be solved, two things are now clear: that for successful treatment of the latter part of the problem, one must have had long training in practical ethics, philanthropic administration, and charitable work, and must have had an internal experience of struggling to live without waste of vital energy and on the plane of the highest personal morality, or, we might say, of the highest psychological hygiene. These only can rescue the vast and ultimate problems of ethics from their present aridity. A merely literary treatment of them may be of great value, as is unquestionably this latest work of the well-known Leipsic psychologist; but it lacks, to our thinking, the one American thing needful, viz., reality.

The last book on our list is but a fragment of three introductory chapters struck off as early as 1875, before the death of Prof. Wilson, and now published by his colleagues. The second chapter, comprising more than half the book, is historical, including the period from Hobbes to Bentham, and contains a very clear presentation of the chief systems of the period.

About Money and Other Things. A Gift-Book. By the Author of 'John Halifax, Gentleman.' Harper & Bros. 1887.

Miss Mulock is one of those authors whom time kindly allows to communicate to their books only the charm of age. Her pages receive the customary welcome due to long acquaintance, but not as a mere matter of custom; they are still solidly useful, and pervaded now by that various and sweet wisdom of age which is best summed up in the word humaneness. In this volume, which is a small collection of practical essays and short tales, we have a piece of literature characteristic of the English home, in which reading for youth is thought better if it have a moral: and for this reason, perhaps, it is called "a gift book" by the author, because it is a book of good counsel, though not of pretty covers. There are in it the title-essay about the duties of the housewife in respect to the use of money for the family, full of domestic sense and honest feeling about those relations of life which grow out of the necessity for material support; the essay upon "Genius," with its rigid insisting that duty lies only the more strictly upon the youth with gifts; the essay upon what makes life worth liv-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing—the making it a Christian life. Besides this express advice, there are the "true stories" of the boyish Australian wanderer remembering in the midst of shipwreck a little incident of his English nursery, and the Scotch youth hunting for employment; and there are two pleasant pictures of vacation ramble—one of the author's house-boat on the Thames with her "six girls" for fellow-voyagers, the other of the Killarney lakes, in which glimpses of Irish character and scenery are skilfully made a plea for reconcilement and mutual kindness between races so long united in everything but in heart. In the days of 'Theophrastus Such,' with his intellectuality, and of such fiction as Daudet dedicates to his son, all this is commonplace and may even seem childish to our forward youth; but the spirit which breathes through these old-fashioned themes is the tradition of practical virtue for a boy's ideal, of kind serviceableness for a girl's, and of broad humanity for a nation's, which lies at the base of historic English character. Unambitious and slight as these pages are, their simple, direct moral teaching, their sound reflections on the common things of life, and the gracious womanliness which is felt pervading them, combine to make this volume excellent home-reading.

Romances of Chivalry. Told, and illustrated in facsimile, by John Ashton. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1887.

THE occupation of a professional book-maker has certainly about it something of the fascination which attends a life of adventure. To be surprised one's self by what one discovers, and then to share that surprise with others, involve two feelings that are productive of special pleasure. There is the individual charm of unexpectedness in learning something which had never before been dreamed of as existing. Then, again, there is the sense of general superiority which arises from communicating to mankind what has previously been confined almost wholly to the generous giver. No wonder that the profession has a fascination which makes it the recreation of many. "In those days," writes Mr. Ashton in this work, "an idle man in search of a job in the adventure line was never long without meeting with one." So it is now. Times change, but human nature does not. Our modern knight-errants of the book-making work sally forth, not to succor distressed damsels or hapless prisoners, but to relieve the wants of suffering communities which hunger and thirst for cheap knowledge and omniscience that can be gained without toil.

These men look upon their employment as a beneficent one, and they are not entirely out of the way in so believing. They are occasionally of great use. They are constantly devising schemes for producing new works on novel subjects, and they sometimes hit upon valuable ones. Mr. Ashton himself struck out a method of portraying the social life of the past by consulting its neglected and almost forgotten ephemeral literature. The work he did might probably have been better done: it was a good deal to have originated the idea of doing it at all. He deserved, therefore, all the success with which he met. Other ventures of his, however, have not been so prosperous, and the volume before us is a failure from almost any point of view from which it can be examined. He has, in it, entered into a region of which he clearly knows little, and which, for any satisfactory account of its peculiarities, requires something more than the capacity to seize upon and chronicle the social small beer of life. It is not, in spite of what he says, an easy region to explore satisfactorily, nor an altogether delightful one to explore at all. He who ventures far into it may come back laden with sheaves; but if he does so, he will surely have to set forth with tears.

The present volume professes to be an attempt to popularize the romances of chivalry. These, Mr. Ashton assures us, are not known at all to the general reader, because no effort has been put forth to make their attractions accessible. Many of them, indeed, have been published by learned societies, but they have rarely got beyond the subscribers' shelves. They are reproduced in their original dress, and in consequence cannot be easily made out save by the special student. To remedy this state of things Mr. Ashton now comes forward with his first list of romances, told and illustrated so as to be readable and entertaining. The list includes a dozen stories such as Sir Bevis of Hampton, Guy of Warwick, The Squire of Low Degree, Valentine and Orson, and others the names of which will be familiar to many who do not know their details. It is evident from the preface that two other collections are to follow, one based upon the Carlovingian cycle of romances, the other upon the Arthurian.

If the public is not delighted, it will not be due to any half-heartedness on the part of the compiler in recommending his wares. Mr. Ashton has set about his task with all that enthusiasm which is apt to attend late acquaintance with a subject or limited knowledge of it. There is, indeed, a sort of naïveté in the almost child-like interest he manifests in the supposed treasures he fancies he has dug up. He is in a perpetual state of astonishment that some particular story has not been more popular. He assures us that these romances were not only highly sensational and full of incident, but also surprises us with the information that they were never prolix, never full of long-winded speeches, until they began to wane at the end of the sixteenth century. As belonging to the body of subscribers to some of the learned societies he mentions, it has been our privilege, or rather our duty, to wade through many of the stories of the kind which have been published. It may be that we attach a peculiar meaning to prolixity and long-windedness, but these words, we should say, denoted two most conspicuous characteristics of these romances. It is to their possession of these qualities that we are disposed to attribute largely the fact of their now being little read or of being little likely to be read. They were suited to the taste of the age in which they came into being. Out of deference to Mr. Ashton's new-born zeal in their behalf, we shall not maintain that the taste of our own age is any better; but it is certainly very different. A story about demons and enchantments and fairies in days when men believed in them could be carried along by its incidents and details; but in days when men no longer believe in demons and enchantments and fairies, there must be an unusual charm in the telling to offset the incredulity with which such incidents and details are received. To that must be added, in the superabundance of our existing literature, a decent regard for the brevity of human life. Neither one of these conditions is found in these romances; and on both grounds there is a curious lack of the literary sense in placing them, as is done in this volume, in comparison with the stories from the Norse or with the 'Arabian Nights.'

Still, there is a certain interest attaching to these romances, and, if sufficiently condensed, their substance might be worth retelling. In this form they might then become popular to a limited extent. In spite of his assurances that they are never prolix, Mr. Ashton does set out to perform the task of condensation, but he has hardly done it in a way to make the tales read by the class for which he has designed them. Let us take, for illustration, the first romance entitled "Melusine." Every now and then Mr. Ashton abandons his own method of recounting the details of the adventures recorded, and says that the story would suffer if it were not told in the very words of the original. These he then proceeds to reproduce, like any editor belonging to the learned societies he mentions. But if there was any desirability of retaining the ancient words, there was certainly no necessity for preserving the ancient spelling in works which are primarily designed to popularize what has been forgotten. Even he who may have been hungering for the knowledge of these romances, can hardly be expected to have his enjoyment heightened by finding "their" spelled "theyr," "each" spelled "eche," "build" spelled "bylde," and by deciphering a hundred similar variations of orthography. Slight modernizations of the inflections also would not affect the literary quality or the interest of the tale to the unlearned reader, for whom the work has been specially prepared. "Madam, I have been somewhat ill at ease, and have had an ague," is a statement that, in its modern English form, may perhaps lose in quaintness, but certainly gains in clearness, as contrasted with the following form in this book, "Madame, I have be [en] somewhat evyl at ease & have had an ager." The adding of the *en* in brackets shows, moreover, a wobbling in the mind of the editor, and would be pretty sure to puzzle the average reader. Mr. Ashton's ambition, also, to tell things he knows as soon as he knows them, is attended with the not uncommon result of his sometimes telling things before he knows them. The vocabulary of the fifteenth century presents no special difficulties, but it is evident that the editor has not invariably mastered the few that exist. There are some passages likewise in the selections reproduced in their original form, in which the early scribe or the modern transcriber must have been at fault. The grammar of no period of the English language can cope successfully with their construction, and if they are of a sort to puzzle the students of our early speech, the outlook for the masses waiting for this work is certainly gloomy. Altogether, we are unable to believe that the early English romances are destined to become absorbingly popular through the well-intentioned efforts of Mr. Ashton.

Ancient Cities, from the Dawn to the Daylight. By William Burnet Wright. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1886.

THE "ancient cities" which form the subject of Mr. Wright's little volume are selected for their relation to the Bible or to early Christianity, and all belong to the Orient except Rome and Athens. The work consists of fifteen sketches, apparently lectures, but some of them are very short for lectures; and, as the subject of the last two is the "New Jerusalem," there are thirteen cities treated. These are all designated by some characteristic epithet—"Ur, the City of Saints," "Nineveh, the City of Soldiers," "Babylon, the City of Sensualists," etc. The scholarship is adequate, although the preface disclaims all pretence to erudition, the style is animated, and the point of view (that of the minister of religion) is serious and orthodox, without being narrow. A better comment could hardly be made upon the atrocious conduct of the crusaders upon entering Jerusalem than this—"that no other sentiment has ever made men so devilish as religious zeal without the spirit of Christ." The book may be heartily commended for what it has aimed to do and for what it has accomplished. We will only make one criticism, that more unity and clearness of view would perhaps have been obtained by selecting a fewer number of cities and treating each with greater fulness.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

A Child of the Revolution: A Novel. Harper's Handy Series. 25 cents.
Adams, B. The Emancipation of Massachusetts. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
A Question of Identity. (No Name Series.) Boston: Roberts Brothers.
Avery, Dr. E. M. Words Correctly Spoken. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Co. 15 cents.
Barrows, Isabel C. Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction. Thirteenth Annual session, 1886. Boston: Press of George H. Ellis.
Baker, W. S. Character Portraits of Washington, as Delineated by Historians, Orators, and Divines, with Biographical Notes and References. Philadelphia: Robert M. Lindsay. $5.
Besant, W. Dorothy Forster: A Novel. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 20 cents.
Bishop, W. H. The Golden Justice. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Browne, Francis F. Life of Abraham Lincoln. N. D. Thompson Publishing Co.
Caswell—Ryan. The Barcarolle. Time and Tune. Book ii. 70 Songs. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.
Clark, Prof. J. S. A Practical Rhetoric, for Instruction in English Composition and Revision in Colleges and Intermediate Schools. Henry Holt & Co. $1.25.
Coleridge, A. D. Goethe's Letters to Zelter. Scribner & Welford.
Curtis, G. T. Creation or Evolution? A Philosophical Inquiry. D. Appleton & Co. $2.
Irelan, Dr. J. R. The Republic; or a History of the United States of America, in the Administrations, from the Monarchic Colonial Days to the Present Times. In 18 volumes. Vols. I. and II. Chicago: Fairbanks and Palmer Publishing Co. $2.50 per vol.
Keigwin, H. W. Principles of Elementary Algebra. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Lawyer's Code of Ethics: A Satire. St. Louis: F. H. Thomas Law Book Co.
Martin, G. Marguerite; or the Isle of Demons. Montreal: Dawson Brothers.
Martineau, Harriet. The Peasant and the Prince: A Story of the French Revolution. Boston: Ginn & Co. 40 cents.
Martin—Wetzler. The Electric Motor and its Applications. Illustrated. W. J. Johnston.
Melmonti, W. G. The Dogaressa. Scribner & Welford. $2.
Nichols, S. H. Monte Rosa: The Epic of an Alp. Second edition. Belford, Clarke & Co.
O'Shea, J. A. Romantic Spain: A Record of Personal Experiences. 2 vols. Scribner & Welford.
Peabody, Elizabeth P. Last Evening with Washington Alston, and Other Papers. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co. $1.50.
Pfeiffer, Emily. Sonnets. Revised and enlarged edition. Scribner & Welford.
Philbrick, Prof. P. H. Beams and Girders: Practical Formulas for their Resistance. D. Van Nostrand. 50c.
Plimpton, F. B. Poems. Illustrated. Cincinnati: Mrs. F. B. Plimpton.
Popular Synonyms. Twenty-five Thousand Words in Ordinary Use. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Co. 12 cents.
Preston, H. W. A Year in Eden. Boston: Roberts Brothers. $1.50.
Price, B. Modern Architectural Practice. No. 1. A Large Country House. W. T. Comstock. $5.
Saltus, E. The Anatomy of Negation. Scribner & Welford.
Scottish Metaphysics Reconstructed in accordance with the Principles of Physical Science. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 40 cents.
Ségur, Mme. la Comtesse de. Les Malheurs de Sophie. W. R. Jenkins.
Sinnett, A. P. Karma: A Novel. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co. 75 cents.
Temple, G. Britta: A Shetland Romance. Harper & Brothers. 25 cents.
Tolstoi, L. Mes Mémoires: Enfance—Adolescence—Jeunesse. Traduit par E. Halpérine. New York: Christern.
Towne, E. O. Aphorisms of the Three Trees. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.
Van Karlstein, H. O. Gotham and the Gothamites. Englished by F. C. Valentine. Chicago: Laird & Lee.
Washburn, Prof. E. A Treatise on the American Law of Real Property. Fifth Edition, by Joseph Willard and Simon G. Crosswell. 3 vols. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
Werner, F. L. Z The Templars in Cyprus: A Dramatic Poem. Translated by E. A. M. Lewis. Scribner & Welford.
Wharton, Dr. F. A Digest of the International Law of the United States, Taken from Documents Issued by Presidents and Secretaries of State, and from Decisions of Federal Courts and Opinions of Attorneys-General. In 3 vols. Washington: State Department.
Whitney, W. D. A Practical French Grammar. Henry Holt & Co. $1.60.
Worthington's Annual, for the Young. Worthington Co. $1.50.
Wright, F. A. Architectural Studies. Vol. I. Low Cost Houses; Store Fronts and Interior Details; Stables: Seaside and Southern Houses; Out-Buildings. W. T. Comstock. $5.
Wright, Henrietta Christian. Children's Stories of American Progress. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.50.
Yonge, Charlotte M. A Modern Telemachus. London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: Harpers.

The Greek in English.

By Thomas D. Goodell, Ph.D., Instructor in the Hartford (Ct) High School. 16mo, pp. 128. Price 75 cents.

This book attempts to teach that limited portion of Greek which college men remember after they have forgotten vastly more—the portion which even those who wish to banish the study of Greek from our schools would admit can least easily be spared, and the portion essential to a ready command of the English tongue. This it tries to do without waste of time or labor.

*** *A sample copy sent, postpaid, to a teacher upon receipt of 38 cents.*

HENRY HOLT & CO.,
Publishers, 29 West 23d St., New York.

4 NEW NOVELS.

A YEAR IN EDEN.

A Novel. By HARRIET WATERS PRESTON, Author of 'Aspendale,' 'Love in the 19th Century,' etc. 12mo. Cloth, $1.50.

AGATHA AND THE SHADOW.

The second volume in the "Old Colony Series" of novels. Uniform in size and style with 'Constance of Acadia.' 12mo. Cloth, $1.50.

A QUESTION OF IDENTITY.

A new novel in the "No Name Series." 16mo. Cloth, $1.00.

MABEL STANHOPE.

A Story. By KATHLEEN O'MEARA, Author of 'Madame Mohl,' etc. 16mo. Cloth, $1.25.

CARVING AND SERVING.

By Mrs. D A. LINCOLN, Author of 'The Boston Cook Book.' Square 12mo. Illuminated board covers. 60 cents.

RIDING FOR LADIES.

With Hints on the Stable. By Mrs. POWER O'DONOGHUE, Author of 'Ladies on Horseback' and 'A Beggar on Horseback.' Very fully illustrated by Chantrey Corbould. Square 12mo. Cloth, gilt, $3.50.

Just published and for sale by all booksellers.
Mailed, postpaid, by the publishers.

Roberts Brothers.

THE BEST MODERN ETCHINGS.

A new Illustrated and Descriptive Catalogue sent by mail on receipt of Ten Cents. FREDERICK KEPPEL & CO., London, and 23 East 16th Street (Union Square), New York.

SCHOOL BOOKS IN FOREIGN LANguages. Miscellaneous Books in Foreign Languages. Catalogues on application. Foreign Periodicals.
CARL SCHOENHOF, Importer. 144 Tremont St., Boston.

NATION—SETS, VOLS., NUMBERS bought and sold by A. S. CLARK, 34 Park Row, N. Y.

"In a Nutshell, a World of Philosophy."

THE MONARCH OF DREAMS.

By THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

No previous work by this author has called forth warmer praise from the best private sources than this brief imaginative story.

One of the most eminent American critics speaks of *"its clear and wholesome depths,"* and adds: *"It is a charming allegory, as full of nature as of fancy."*

Another says that it gives *"in a nutshell a world of philosophy."*

A distinguished writer of fiction says: *"When I first read the little book which holds so much between its slender covers I thought, it is Hawthorne over again; and I see that others have had the same idea; but afterwards it seemed to me of more far-reaching purpose and deeper insight than Hawthorne used, and much too bold and original to be compared with any other work."*

The Boston *Transcript* says of it: *"This little book has but one fault—there is not enough of it."*

The Boston *Traveller* says: *"The book is worthy to become a classic in American literature."*

The Cambridge *Press* says: *"It seems to us quite as original as anything evolved from the imagination of any English or American writer of the past or the present."*

CLOTH, FIFTY CENTS.

Sold by all Booksellers, and sent by Mail, Postpaid, on Receipt of Price.

Lee and Shepard,

PUBLISHERS, BOSTON.

German Simplified.

An eminently practical new method for learning the German language. Edition for self-instruction, in 12 numbers (with keys), at 10 cents each; school edition (without keys), bound in cloth, $1.25. For sale by all booksellers. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by Prof. A. Knoflach, 140 Nassau St., New York. Prospectus free.

THE MORAVIAN RAG DOLL,

to quote a prominent writer, "is the most Christian-looking and beautifully dressed doll I have ever seen; my children are delighted with it." $3 (night dress 30 cents extra), carefully packed, registered, and post-paid. A most welcome gift at all times. Full description most cheerfully given. "DOLLS," Box 185, Bethlehem, Pa.

TAUCHNITZ & JOUAUST LIBRARIES.

(ENGLISH AND FRENCH NOVELS AND CLASSICS.)
Beautiful books, printed in clear type and handsomely bound, at low prices.
SEND STAMP FOR CATALOGUES TO
DUPRAT & CO., dealers in Rare and Modern Books, 5 East 17th Street, New York.

BOOKS FOR SALE.

LAROUSSE. Grand Dictionnaire universel du XIXe Siecle. 16 vols., 4to, bound in full sheepsk. New. Containing 22,100 pages. Printed in 4 columns. Latest Edition. $150.00.

LITTRÉ, E. Dictionnaire de la langue française. With Supplement. 5 vols., 4to, bound in full cloth. New. Latest Edition. $35.00.

APPLETON. The American Cyclopædia. With Index. 17 vols. New Series. 1876-1882. 7 vols. Together 24 vols., royal 8vo, bound in ½ morocco, with corners, marbled edges. New. Latest Edition. $125.00.

JOHN DELAY, 23 Union Square,
NEW YORK.

STOCK-TAKING.

Rare and surprising bargains in books. Before taking inventory in February, we offer our entire stock of Books at vastly reduced prices. Catalogue ready.

WORTHINGTON CO.,
747 Broadway, New York.

DIAMOND HAMS
AND BREAKFAST BACON.

S. DAVIS, JR., Cincinnati.
FORTY-SIXTH YEAR.

The Centennial Commission in 1876 reported an award to these Hams. "First, the excellent flavor of the meat." "Second, its good keeping quality, demonstrated by the perfect freshness of hams cured in 1873." Sold by T. Lidgerwood, D. H. Decker & Son, Houston & Steinle, S. H. Williamson, and others.

NASH & PIERCE, 80 NASSAU ST., N. Y., Booksellers. Local History, Genealogy, First American Editions, Old and Scarce Books in all departments. Catalogues sent on application.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED